

The JOURNAL of
**SOUTHERN
HISTORY**

VOL. VII

MAY, 1941

No. 2



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME VII

MAY, 1941

NUMBER 2

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



BOARD OF EDITORS

AVERY O. CRAVEN

University of Chicago

FRANK L. OWSLEY

Vanderbilt University

WALTER B. POSEY

Birmingham-Southern College

W. NEIL FRANKLIN

The National Archives

ROBERT S. COTTERILL

Florida State College for Women

ROBERT H. WOODY

Duke University

PAUL H. BUCK

Harvard University

ELLA LONN

Goucher College

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME VII

MAY, 1941

NUMBER 2



Copyright, 1941, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>Horace Greeley and Peaceable Secession.</i> By David M. Potter	145
<i>The South Carolina Rice Factor as Revealed in the Papers of Robert F. W. Allston.</i> By J. H. Easterby	160
<i>Conflicting Cotton Interests at Home and Abroad, 1848-1857.</i> By Thomas P. Martin	173
<i>Economic Conditions in the Confederacy as Seen by the French Consuls.</i> By Gordon Wright	195
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Rutledge, "The Dictator." By Robert W. Barnwell, Jr.	215
The Journal of a Party of Emigrating Creek Indians, 1835-1836. Edited by Gaston Litton	225
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Crouse, <i>French Pioneers in the West Indies, 1624-1664</i> , by Harris Gaylord Warren	243
Wright, <i>The First Gentlemen of Virginia: Intellectual Qualities of the Early Colonial Ruling Class</i> , by Helen Duprey Bullock	244
Wertenbaker, <i>Torchbearer of the Revolution: The Story of Bacon's Rebellion and Its Leader</i> , by Lester J. Cappon	245
McJimsey, <i>Topographic Terms in Virginia</i> , by W. Edwin Hemphill	246
Barker, <i>The Background of the Revolution in Maryland</i> , by Hayes Baker-Crothers	248
Knollenberg, <i>Washington and the Revolution: A Reappraisal; Gates, Conway, and the Continental Congress</i> , by Leonard Lundin	249
DeMond, <i>The Loyalists in North Carolina During the Revolution</i> , by C. C. Crittenden	251
Burson, <i>The Stewardship of Don Esteban Miró, 1782-1792</i> , by Thomas Robson Hay	252
Coulter, <i>Thomas Spalding of Sapelo</i> , by Ralph B. Flanders	253
Hatcher, <i>Edward Livingston: Jeffersonian Republican and Jacksonian Democrat</i> , by Russell J. Ferguson	255
Stevens, <i>Pistols at Ten Paces: The Story of the Code of Honor in America</i> , by Edwin Adams Davis	256
McDermott and Salvan, <i>Tixier's Travels on the Osage Prairies</i> , by H. Bailey Carroll	257
Rister, <i>Border Captives: The Traffic in Prisoners by Southern Plains Indians, 1835-1875</i> , by H. Bailey Carroll	257
Dale and Litton, <i>Cherokee Cavaliers: Forty Years of Cherokee History as Told in the Correspondence of the Ridge-Watie-Boudinot Family</i> , by Rupert N. Richardson	260
Douglas, <i>I Rode with Stonewall: The War Experiences of the Youngest Member of Jackson's Staff</i> , by Donald Bridgman Sanger	261
Hamlin, "Old Bald Head" (General R. S. Ewell), by Charles R. Wilson	263
Couper, <i>One Hundred Years at V. M. I.</i> , III and IV, by William M. Robinson, Jr.	264
Rothery, <i>Virginia, The New Dominion</i> , by Allen W. Moger	266
Williams, <i>The Vanishing Virginian</i> , by W. Edwin Hemphill	268
Lumpkin, <i>The South in Progress</i> , by Virginius Dabney	269
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
Personal	271
Historical Societies	274
Bibliographical	275
<i>Contributors</i>	285

Horace Greeley and Peaceable Secession

BY DAVID M. POTTER

The victory of Abraham Lincoln in the presidential election of November 6, 1860, marked the end of a campaign that had preoccupied the public mind for some months. Under normal circumstances the long period of tenseness would have been followed by a reaction, as tired campaigners relaxed and successful ones exulted. For this electoral harvest, however, there was to be no festival. Even before the votes were counted, the legislature of South Carolina had ominously chosen to remain in session in order that it might instantly set the secession ball rolling if the "Black Republicans" should be the victors. True to its purpose, the legislature, within four days of the election, passed an act providing for a state convention to meet in December. Thus the secession crisis followed instantly upon the excitement of the campaign. Instead of affording a respite, the election heightened the tenseness. Republican leaders who had expected four months of grace in which to prepare for their direction of national policy were confronted by an exigent and rapid-moving crisis.

In the circumstances they appeared at their worst. For four months they evaded, equivocated, shifted, blundered, and sought refuge in fantasy. Of their chief leaders, William H. Seward gave incessant and prolix expression to a somewhat mystical conviction that the portentous and explicit acts of the South were evidences of a passing frenzy which would subside of itself. Meanwhile, Lincoln resorted to a complete, impenetrable, and alarming silence. Lesser Republicans, for the most part, met the crisis no more effectively than their two foremost leaders, and thus throughout the winter their tone was generally either blustering or vacillating, and, in either case, unrealistic.

Out of this welter of confusion one voice rose above the din with promptness and emphasis, and, as it seemed, with clarity. This was the voice of Horace Greeley. Before the crisis was three days old he wrote off, in his characteristic illegible hand, the most quoted sentence that his *New York Tribune* ever carried to a waiting public: "if the Cotton States shall become satisfied that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace."

Greeley did not know it, but he had contributed a footnote to history. For decades since he sent his startling pronouncement to the composing room, historians have pictured the general confusion as the secession movement got under way, and have scrupulously mentioned that a respectable minority of Northerners, unwilling to plunge the nation into war, sought peace by separation. To those who detect such a willingness to separate, the *Tribune* is, of course, the perfect illustration. Horace Greeley is the personification of this sentiment, and his editorial of November 9 is their perennial footnote. His facile assertion that "we insist on letting them go in peace" has become an accepted stage property in the drama of history. In whole or in part, *verbatim*, or in most literal paraphrase, his vivid declaration has passed from tome to textbook. Greeley himself started it upon the road to repetition by republishing his entire editorial in *The American Conflict* (1864).¹ Within the same year it was abridged and distorted by the excision of all reservations and conditions, so that it appeared to give unqualified acceptance to secession,² and in this deleted form it has been making the rounds ever since. It appears in the *American Nation Series*³ and in the *Chronicles of America*,⁴ it is used in standard older

¹ Horace Greeley, *The American Conflict*, 2 vols. (Hartford, 1864-1866), I, 358-59.

² Abridged by S. D. Carpenter, in *Logic of History* (Madison, Wis., 1864), 86. The writer does not mean to say that other authors have quoted Carpenter, but only that the editorial has been abridged constantly since the war.

³ "The New York *Tribune*, which held the position of leadership among Republican journals, and which was a power throughout the north, was proclaiming that 'if the Cotton States shall become satisfied that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace'. . . . Nor was Greeley alone in his views; the abolitionists professing anxiety to accomplish the extinction of slavery were arguing that the South should be permitted to secede. Governor Moore of Alabama was hailing them as 'our best friends.'" French E. Chadwick, *Causes of the Civil War* (New York, 1906), 164-65.

⁴ "What strikes us most forcibly, as we look back upon that day, is the widespread desire for peace. . . .

works such as those of James Ford Rhodes,⁵ Edward Channing,⁶ and Albert Bushnell Hart;⁷ it appears also in more recent interpretations by Arthur C. Cole⁸ and James Truslow Adams;⁹ it is employed similarly by Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager,¹⁰ by Charles and

"Horace Greeley said in an editorial in the *New York Tribune*: 'If the cotton states shall decide [Greeley said "shall become satisfied," not "shall decide"] that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we shall insist [Greeley said "insist," not "shall insist"] on letting them go in peace. . . . Whenever a considerable section of our Union shall deliberately resolve to go out, we shall resist all coercive measures designed to keep them in [Greeley said "it in," not "them in"]. We hope never to live in a republic where [Greeley said "whereof"] one section is pinned to the residue by bayonets.' " Nathaniel W. Stephenson, *Abraham Lincoln and the Union* (New Haven, 1921), 90.

⁵ "Another phase of opinion was both represented and led by Horace Greeley. Three days after the election, the *New York Tribune*, in a leading article, said: 'If the cotton States shall decide [Greeley said "shall become satisfied," not "shall decide"] that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace.' " James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the Final Restoration of Home Rule at the South in 1877*, 7 vols. (New York, 1893-1906), III, 140.

⁶ "Horace Greeley, in the *New York Tribune* wrote that if the Southern States want to leave the Union, they have an absolute moral right to do so." Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*, 6 vols. (New York, 1905-1925), VI, 292.

⁷ "The belief that the Union was no union was not confined to Breckinridge Democrats, for the Republican journalist and leader, Horace Greeley, was in the clearest tones preaching non-resistance; on November 9, 1860, his *New York Tribune* declared that 'if the cotton States shall decide [Greeley said "shall become satisfied," not "shall decide"] that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace.' " Albert B. Hart, *Salmon Portland Chase* (Boston, 1899), 199.

⁸ "Other Northerners of the 'hopelessly abolitionized' type rejoiced with Greeley at the opportunity to 'let the erring sisters depart in peace.' If some of these talked of the South's right to self-government and self-determination, it is clear that their deeper motive was to rid the nation of responsibility for an undesirable institution." Arthur C. Cole, *The Irrepressible Conflict, 1850-1865* (New York, 1934), 304.

⁹ "Three days after the election Horace Greeley wrote in *The Tribune* advising that if the Southern States should secede, although the movement would be a revolutionary one, they should be allowed to go in peace. 'We hope never to live in a Republic, whereof one section is pinned to the residue by bayonets.' " James T. Adams, *America's Tragedy* (New York, 1934), 147-48.

¹⁰ "Horace Greeley of the *New York Tribune* and General Winfield Scott struck the key-note of Northern sentiment in January with the phrase 'Wayward sisters, depart in peace!' " Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, 2 vols. (New York, 1937), I, 539. In attributing these attitudes to Greeley and Scott as of January, the authors ignore the facts that Greeley had begun to qualify his "go in peace" utterances as early as December, and that General Scott, although inclined to accept secession as early as October, 1860, did not use the phrase "Wayward sisters, depart in peace" until March 3, 1861. Even then he did not actually propose to address the seceding states thus, but only enumerated this as one of four alternative policies which might be adopted toward the South.

Mary Beard,¹¹ by Arthur M. Schlesinger,¹² John Spencer Bassett,¹³ Harold U. Faulkner,¹⁴ and by uncounted others. It is stock in trade. Horace Greeley has been identified with peaceable separation just as thoroughly as Henry VIII with matrimony or Machiavelli with duplicity.

If this interpretation had been a palpable fraud, it could never have achieved such currency. It was necessarily based upon a half-truth at least—a half-truth which could slip by the unwary, secure admittance in good academic society, and, when challenged, present its veracious side to view. Thus if Greeley had never said "we insist on letting them go in peace," he could scarcely have been identified with peaceable separation. But once he had uttered that single, misquotable phrase, it made no difference that he had previously taken a most belligerent tone, and, after a brief interlude, was to revert to it; it did not matter that his editorials both previously and during the crisis suggested quite plainly that expediency caused him to pretend to offer a separation which he did not expect the South to accept; it was of no consequence that the vivid phrase and others like it were surrounded by conditions and reservations and ambiguities that went far to nullify the apparent meaning. The *Tribune* said "go in peace," and that was plain enough. History has been content to leave it at that.

¹¹ "Horace Greeley wrote in the *Tribune*: 'If the cotton states shall decide [Greeley said "shall become satisfied," not "shall decide"] that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace. The right to secede may be a revolutionary one but it exists nevertheless.' " Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*, 2 vols. (New York, 1927), II, 63.

¹² "Antislavery radicals, for their part, declared publicly that the departure of the slave states was good riddance. 'If the cotton States shall decide [Greeley said "shall become satisfied," not "shall decide"] that they can do better out of the Union than in it,' asserted the *New York Tribune*, 'we insist on letting them go in peace.' " Arthur M. Schlesinger, *Political and Social Growth of the United States, 1852-1933* (New York, 1936), 50.

¹³ "At the same time the *New York Tribune* and abolitionists generally, were asserting plainly that the North could not conquer the South and that the South, if it so wished, should be allowed to 'depart in peace.' " John S. Bassett, *A Short History of the United States* (New York, 1939), 512.

¹⁴ "In addition to the economic interests there were many abolitionists who evidently believed the Union would be as well off without the slave states. 'If the cotton states shall decide [Greeley said "shall become satisfied," not "shall decide"] that they can do better out of the Union than in it,' said Greeley in December [sic!], 'we shall insist [Greeley said "insist," not "shall insist"] on letting them go in peace,' and this sentiment was echoed by Wendell Phillips and Henry Ward Beecher." Harold U. Faulkner, *American Political and Social History* (New York, 1938), 331.

Historians who rely on this passage and depict Greeley in the role of a pacifist must recognize, of course, that his words in November, 1860, conformed ill with his position a few months before or a few months after that time. For he had been, and was in the future to be, quite bellicose; so aggressive an editor was rare, even in that day of ink-stained pugnacity. In the previous January, shortly after John Brown went to the gallows, the *Tribune* warned "Democratic Disunionists" that Virginia had no "monopoly of the hanging of traitors."¹⁵ During the campaign for Lincoln's election Greeley declared that if South Carolina should "undertake to repeat in 1861 the tantrums of 1833," she would be "treated as she was then—kindly but firmly."¹⁶ After the election he dropped this menacing tone completely for a time, but within eight months he was goading the administration into a premature and bloody battle on the Plains of Manassas.¹⁷ Clearly, the abhorrence of force which is attributed to Greeley as of November, 1860, was, if sincere, both brief and out of character.

Scholars have tended to dismiss this inconsistency with the facile explanation that Greeley was utterly erratic.¹⁸ This, indeed, he was. It is also sometimes assumed that he was transparently sincere. But no entirely sincere person could have practiced the adroit treachery which he used to prevent the nomination of Seward in 1860. He had not spent his life among the New York politicians for nothing, and he did not publish everything that crossed his mind. The columns of the

¹⁵ The New York *Tribune*, January 5, 1860, said: "It is striking how gentle the fire-eaters have become since the Republicans have caused it to be understood that they do not think that Virginia ought to have a monopoly of the hanging of traitors. It is perhaps as well, however, for them to understand that the future Republican administrators of Federal power will not try and execute the Democratic Disunionists, who may hereafter fall into their hands with the indecent haste exhibited by Virginia in the case of John Brown."

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, July 25, 1860.

¹⁷ On June 26, 1861, and thereafter until First Manassas, the *Tribune* carried the cry, "Forward to Richmond! Forward to Richmond! The Rebel Congress must not be allowed to meet there on the 20th of July! BY THAT DATE THE PLACE MUST BE HELD BY THE NATIONAL ARMY!" Charles A. Dana, the managing editor, phrased this outburst, but it could not have continued to appear in the *Tribune* unless Greeley so willed.

¹⁸ Rhodes, *History of the United States*, III, 141, remarks that others beside Greeley supported peaceable secession, and that the proposal was not "merely the erratic outburst of an eccentric thinker."

Tribune were not his confessional. Like other newspaper editors less angelic of countenance, less innocent of manner, he was writing not for self-expression, but for designed effect upon definite groups of people.

Before examining whether Greeley's motives coincided with his words, it is essential to inquire whether his words coincided with the interpretation which history has assigned to them. The famous editorial was not nearly so clear-cut as historians have left their readers to suppose. The editor of the *Tribune* used emphatic words, but, like Humpty-Dumpty, he thoughtfully inserted a provision that they should mean whatever he wished them to mean.

After certain preliminary observations the editorial turned to the question of northern policy with reference to secession:

if the Cotton States shall become satisfied that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace. The right to secede may be a revolutionary one, but it exists nevertheless; and we do not see how one party can have a right to do what another party has a right to prevent And whenever a considerable section of our Union shall deliberately resolve to go out, we shall resist all coercive measures designed to keep it in. We hope never to live in a republic whereof one section is pinned to the residue by bayonets.

Thus far the *Tribune* was bold, sweeping, and, as the textbooks testify, quotable. It was, of course, not very explicit; it did not say what would be accepted as proof of a deliberate resolve to go out, nor what Federal instrumentality should recognize secession; it did not specify whether the president might suspend operation of the laws, nor what attitude it would take if the northern people refused to recognize the right of secession, which, it agreed, "might be revolutionary"; it left room for several difficulties. But such details seem trifles in the presence of Greeley's forceful and dramatic language—language which produces a much more vivid mental impression than the passages which follow.

The first of these continued:

But while we thus uphold the practical liberty if not the abstract right of secession, we must insist that the step be taken, if it ever shall be, with the deliberation and gravity befitting so momentous an issue. Let ample time be

given for reflection; let the subject be fully canvassed before the people; and let a popular vote be taken in every case before secession is decreed. Let the people be told just why they are urged to break up the confederation; let them have both sides of the question fully presented; let them reflect, deliberate, then vote; and let the act of secession be the echo of an unmistakable popular fiat. A judgment thus rendered, a demand for separation so backed, would either be acquiesced in without the effusion of blood, or those who rushed upon carnage to defy and defeat it would place themselves clearly in the wrong.

In brief the *Tribune* now insisted that secession was acceptable only as a deliberate and orderly execution of the clearly-expressed popular will. This was reasonable; but any dialectician will suspiciously observe that the *Tribune* had tacitly reserved full jurisdiction in deciding what was deliberate, what was orderly, and what was an authentic expression of public opinion. It hastened to exercise this jurisdiction in the very next paragraph:

The measures now being inaugurated in the Cotton States with a view (apparently) to Secession, seem to us destitute of gravity and legitimate force. They bear the unmistakakble [*sic*] impress of haste—of passion—of distrust of the popular judgment. They seem clearly intended to precipitate the South into rebellion [N. B.!] before the baselessness of the clamors which have misled and excited her can be ascertained by the great body of her people[.] We trust that they will be confronted with calmness, with dignity, and with unwavering trust in the inherent strength of the Union and the loyalty of the American People.¹⁹

Thus ended the famous “go in peace” editorial. It might fairly be summarized as follows: First, the South may depart in peace. Second, she must observe certain forms in doing so. Third, she is not, in the present movement, observing these forms. This was equivalent to saying: we concede in the abstract a certain right of withdrawal, but that has nothing to do with the present case. Far from agreeing to actual secession, this merely shifted the ground on which secession would be opposed. It was not so much surrender as it was strategic retreat.

The fictitious nature of Greeley’s “acquiescence” in secession was made even more transparent in later editorials. In the ensuing weeks he constantly reiterated his declaration that an authentic secession ought to be permitted, and, with equal constancy, appended some form of

¹⁹ New York *Tribune*, November 9, 1860.

joker to neutralize any practical applicability which might have crept into his generalizations. At one time he specified that secession must be ratified by a popular vote; at another time he insisted that it must be the act of "six or eight contiguous states." Again, it must be adopted by the "pretty unanimous . . . resolve" of the southern people; it must not be done with any view to securing inducements to return to the Union; the seceding states must first demonstrate their potential ability to "form an independent, self-subsisting nation"; they must show "due regard for the rights and interests of those they leave behind."²⁰

At times the verbal tricks and dodges of the *Tribune* were a travesty upon the word "secession." Thus: "If she [Florida] will only pay back the money which she has cost the Union, and take herself off quietly, we will warrant Uncle Sam never to offer even One Cent Reward for her return."²¹ Similarly, "No Southern republic could be allowed to take or possess the mouth of the Mississippi."²² Or, as a final example of naked duplicity: "Let South Carolina secede as far as she wishes so long as she pays the duties and respects the forts."²³

About three weeks after its first declarations the *Tribune* made a notable shift of ground. Still maintaining a show of nonaggressive feeling, it subtly altered its definition of the "right of secession," which it had ostensibly recognized. By its new definition secession was not a

²⁰ *Ibid.*, January 14, 1861: "If they [the cotton states] will . . . take . . . a fair vote by ballot of their own citizens, none being coerced nor intimidated, and that vote shall indicate a settled resolve to get out of the Union, I will do all I can to help them out."

On December 17, 1860, the *Tribune* said: "But if seven or eight contiguous States shall present themselves authentically at Washington, saying, 'We hate the Federal Union; we have withdrawn from it . . . , we could not stand up for coercion."

On December 8: "whenever six or eight contiguous States shall have formally seceded from the Union, and avowed the pretty unanimous and earnest resolve of their People to *stay out*, it will not be found practicable to coerce them."

On December 24: "whenever a portion of this Union large enough to form an independent, self-subsisting nation, shall see fit to say authentically to the residue, 'We want to get away from you,' we shall say . . . 'Go!'"

On December 28: "should they [seek separation] . . . with . . . due regard for the rights and interests of those they leave behind, we shall feel bound to urge and insist that their wishes be gratified."

²¹ *Ibid.*, November 24, 1860.

²² *Ibid.*, November 19, 1860. See also, *ibid.*, November 30, 1860.

²³ *Ibid.*, December 21, 1860.

matter of state action, but was a process to be consummated by a Federal constitutional convention. In detail the procedure suggested was this:

We trust, therefore, that, if the Cotton States should resolve to secede, they will quietly and inoffensively announce their determination to do so, asking Congress to call a Convention to arrange the terms of separation. They must be aware that this is a work of difficulty—that time is required to effect it—and that . . . [the] President, will be constrained by his inauguration oath to collect the revenue and enforce the laws throughout the entire area of our country until such separation shall have been duly effected. But if they really desire to go out, and will allow time to effect the separation peacefully, we shall do what we can to persuade the North to accede to their wishes.²⁴

Holding fast to this position, Greeley rode out the crisis, and when war came he insisted, as he continued to insist throughout his life, that he had been prepared to accept the decision of the people of the South.²⁵ Perhaps he actually believed this himself. But a detached spectator can hardly do so. The plain fact is that the *Tribune* editor said one thing and meant another, and that, to veil this inconsistency, he resorted to one of the oldest and simplest tricks of casuistry—an alteration in the definition of his words. The “secession” of which he spoke was antithetical to “secession” as it was generally understood. His doctrine of dissolution by general consent had no more to do with secession than philosophical anarchism has to do with bomb throwing. And his record as a whole tends to impair rather than sustain the historical tradition that there was a powerful and sincere movement for peaceable separation.

This conclusion, if it be accepted, entails an imperative question. If Greeley disliked peaceable secession, why did he feign approval of it? Why should he give lip service to a cause to which he was hostile? If his was the bellicose spirit which drove Irvin McDowell prematurely “On to Richmond,” why did he at first make such a great show of reluctance to coerce the secessionists?

This query looks to a concealed motive, and it is not to be expected

²⁴ *Ibid.*, November 26, 1860.

²⁵ Horace Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life* (New York, 1868), 398.

that such a motive can be categorically defined. But despite the presence of hidden factors it is possible to say, with some degree of assurance, that the motive was double, and that its duality consisted in a purpose to mollify the people of the South by avoiding threats against them, and a purpose to offer a fictitious alternative to frightened Northerners, who might otherwise choose concession as the only alternative to war.

With reference to the people of the South it was evident, on the face of it, that threats of coercion would only serve to inflame the southern temper, "fire the Southern heart," and strengthen the southern radicals; whereas a show of acquiescence might disarm the southern fear of aggression, remind the South of the fellowship that had existed in the Union, and give southern unionists an opportunity to rally their forces. Inasmuch as southern anger flared up at every threat, it obviously behooved the friends of union to avoid threatening language.

Greeley was by no means unconscious of this consideration, nor was he unresponsive to its implications for his own policy. He knew that a denial of the right of secession would constitute a challenge to the South to assert it, whereas an acceptance of it would cause the South to consider more carefully the advantages of the Union and the self-inflicted penalties of destroying it. Historians should have been forewarned that Greeley was influenced by this aspect of the matter, and they should, accordingly, have discounted his literal words. For he himself stated the point, with directness and simplicity, as early as May 2, 1854, in an editorial which foreshadowed, and deciphered, as it were, his policy in the crisis six years later:

We would have the North, whenever the South shall cry out, "Hold me! hold me! for I'm desperate, and shall hurt somebody!"—coolly answer, "Hold yourself, if you need holding; for we have better business on hand,"—and this would be found after a little to exert a decidedly sedative, tranquillizing effect on the too susceptible nerves of our too excitable Southern brethren. Instead of bolting the door in alarm, and calling for help to guard it, in case the South should hereafter threaten to walk out of the Union, we would hold it politely open and suggest to the departing the policy of minding his eye and buttoning his coat well under his chin preparatory to facing the rough weather outside.

And this, we insist, is the true mode of reducing his paroxysms and causing him to desist from such raw-head demonstrations in [the] future.²⁶

This was a plain avowal of opportunism, and of course it could not be repeated too freely without defeating its own end at the crucial moment. But it is significant that six years before the crisis, Greeley outlined his plan for mollifying the South and scotching secession by offering free rein to the fire-eaters. This generous offer, he supposed, would disarm opposition, and, with equal generosity, be refused. Thus his acquiescence in separation was designed not to avert battle, but to avert separation. It is clear, too, that he continued to adhere to this view, for he suggested again at the height of the crisis that expediency, and not conviction, dictated his words. Thus:

But one thing we must firmly and always insist on—that there shall be no bribing, no coaxing, no wheedling those to stay in the Union who want to get out. Every step in this direction tends to confirm the Slave States in their mistaken notion that the Union is more advantageous to us than to them—that it is a contrivance to . . . enrich the North at the cost of the South. And this is to-day the chief source of National peril. It is because the Southern people have been persistently told that the Free States would be pecuniarily ruined by disunion . . . that we are eternally threatened with Secession. Let it be fully and fairly understood that the benefits of the Union are mutual—that we don't want the South to remain in the Union out of charity to us—and this eternal menace of Nullification and Secession will be hushed forever.²⁷

All this suggests that Greeley used disunion to defend the Union, offered secession to defeat the secessionists, agreed to an abstract proposition to forestall its practical application. It does not suggest at all that he was sincerely committed to voluntary separation.²⁸

But if Greeley was impelled partly by a desire to stay the secession movement in the South, he was governed scarcely less by a purpose to prevent a policy of "appeasement" at the North. If, in fact, he felt any real tolerance of disunion, it sprang not from his horror of war, but

²⁶ New York *Tribune*, May 2, 1854.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, November 19, 1860.

²⁸ Another oblique motive with reference to the South appears in the *Tribune*, December 17, 1860: "We would expose the seceders to odium as disunionists, not commend them to pity as the gallant though mistaken upholders of the rights of their section in an uneven military conflict."

from his horror of slavery and of compromise with slavery. In his antislavery zeal he sometimes proclaimed that, as between slavery extension and disunion, he would choose disunion. Thus: "Let the Union be a thousand times shivered rather than we should aid you to plant Slavery on Free Soil."²⁹ But this did not argue that he was actually prepared to accept either disunion or slavery. Men who somewhat rhetorically choose "death before dishonor" usually do not seek either alternative, and it is safe to surmise that Greeley's "disunion before compromise" was analogous.³⁰

In a sense the whole misconception of Greeley's position arises from a failure to perceive the alternatives in the light of which he acted. It is often tacitly assumed that he simply preferred secession to coercion—disunion to bloodshed—peace to war.³¹ This assumption is in part justified by such phrases as the one in which the *Tribune* affirmed its aversion to a Union pinned together by bayonets. But the one alternative which did most to condition Greeley's response was that of compromise. Compromise was a familiar, recurrent experience, whereas fratricidal warfare remained a contingency often discussed but never realized. It was compromise which Greeley dreaded, and in preference to it any alternative, however obnoxious—even disunion—seemed the better choice. If he toyed with the idea of peaceable secession, it was not because brute conquest repelled him, but because the remaining alternative, "disgraceful compromise," seemed to him "the unpardon-

²⁹ *Ibid.*, February 20, 1850.

³⁰ E.g., the *Tribune* of December 3, 1860, said: "Then 'let the winds howl on,' until it shall be settled . . . that the Free States will not surrender their convictions nor their principles even to a threat that the Union shall be dissolved if they do not."

³¹ An example of such an assumption follows: "Men who had never before taken seriously the Southern threats of disunion had waked suddenly to a terrified consciousness that they were in for it. . . .

"The very type of these people and of their reaction was Horace Greeley. . . . He was wallowing in panic. He began to scream editorially. The Southern extremists were terribly in earnest; if they wanted to go, go they would, and go they should . . . what was the Union compared with bloodshed? There must be no war—no war. Such was Greeley's terrified appeal to the North." Nathaniel W. Stephenson, *Lincoln* (Indianapolis, 1922), 109-10.

able sin."³² He himself indicated, in a letter to Abraham Lincoln, how completely aversion to compromise overshadowed all other considerations in his mind:

"I fear nothing, care for nothing, but another disgraceful back-down of the free States. That is the only real danger. Let the Union slide—it may be reconstructed; let Presidents be assassinated, we can elect more; let the Republicans be defeated and crushed, we shall rise again. But another nasty compromise, whereby everything is conceded and nothing secured, will so thoroughly disgrace and humiliate us that we can never again raise our heads, and this country becomes a second edition of the Barbary States as they were sixty years ago. 'Take any form but that.' "³³

And again, some ten years later, when war hysteria had died out, Greeley reaffirmed that his "controlling conviction from first to last" had been a resolute adherence to every point of the antislavery position; he did not mention his devotion to peace. For the obloquy which his policy had brought upon him, he found "consolation" in the fact that he had "done something toward arresting the spring-tide of Northern servility that set strongly in favor of 'conciliation'" rather than in the fact that he had tried to avert the slaughter.³⁴

Quotations might be multiplied *ad nauseam*, but the mere chronology of events renders quotations superfluous. As late as October 26, 1860, the *Tribune* spurned disunion.³⁵ Soon after that a crisis arose. Judging by previous crises, such as that of 1850, a compromise was likely to result. At once the *Tribune* fell away from its emphatic unionism. But as the possibility of compromise faded away, and the prospect of war grew imminent, the militant unionism of the *Tribune* returned. In other words, when confronted by a choice between compromise and peaceable secession, Greeley chose peaceable secession; but when con-

³² New York *Tribune*, December 15, 1860: "Consenting to a disgraceful Compromise with Disunionists and traitors, will be the Unpardonable Sin . . . in the eyes of the Northern people."

³³ Greeley to Lincoln, December 22, 1860, in John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, A History*, 10 vols. (New York, 1890), III, 258.

³⁴ Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, 397-98.

³⁵ On that day the *Tribune* said: "Mr. Lincoln's election may now be set down as certain; and it is quite time the Southern ultraists should be given to understand that they are to receive from this quarter no aid or countenance in their disunion and secession projects."

fronted by a choice between war and peaceful secession, Greeley chose war. In the light of this it is hard to understand the persistence with which historians have represented him as a champion of voluntary dissolution.

In many respects the policy of the *Tribune*, like other policies of the same time, is inexplicable except in the light of the continued incredulity of secession. For thirty years the northern opposition had built up this incredulity like an antitoxin from the sterile germs of threat unsupported by act. So strong was the antitoxin now that the shock of actual and virulent secession could not break it down. Conventions might meet, ordinances be framed, flags fly, cockades blossom, and regiments march, without enforcing conviction upon the Republican mind.

Thus Greeley, on the very same day that he told the South to go in peace, assured his readers that "we are convinced that the agitation raised in the South will gradually and surely subside into peace,"⁸⁶ and only the day before he still described the newspapers which predicted a crisis as "silly, gasconading journals."⁸⁷ Later, he found the threats of 1860 tame compared with those of 1832,⁸⁸ felt sure Carolina would shrink from the "solitary plunge,"⁸⁹ and was certain that "the great majority do not . . . mean to break up the Union. They simply mean to bully the Free States into concessions."⁹⁰

Here was the very heart and essence of the *Tribune* position. Greeley had no more idea of dividing the Union than Solomon had of dividing the infant; he depended on patriotism to refuse his offer, just as the wise king depended on maternal love to save the child. And when at last it dawned upon Greeley that he was confronted by a revolution and not by a maneuver in the game of party politics, he beat a retreat in haste behind a cover of equivocations, quibbles, and puns on the word secession.

History cannot search souls and it cannot declare with certainty what

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, November 9, 1860.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, November 8, 1860.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, November 12, 1860.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, November 15, 1860.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, November 20, 1860. The writer has inverted the phrases in this quotation.

were the motives of Horace Greeley, or of any other man. But at least it can say that the evidence does not support the interpretation usually placed upon his acts, and that, indeed, it supports an interpretation which is very nearly opposite.

Considered from this aspect the significance of Greeley's vociferation is a curious one. Insofar as the cause of voluntary separation depended upon him, it was a phantom from the beginning. If his attitude was typical (as historians assume), the go-in-peace program was devoid of appreciable support and never achieved a place in the realm of practicable solutions. It was, in this sense, altogether illusory and undeserving of the notice which history has given it. But, like other illusions and red herrings, it bore an enormous importance. For it constantly obscured the clarity of the true alternatives—compromise and war. Could the great mass of people have seen these alternatives in naked antithesis, they would hardly have rushed upon the sword. But the champions of compromise were never able, until too late, to convince the public that bloodshed would ensue upon the refusal of concessions. The delusion of peaceable secession always rose up to obscure the stern logic of the situation and to make *Cassandras* of those who sought for an adjustment. Like a smoke screen the talk of separation in peace concealed the fact that the choice was between compromise and war. The veil of smoke was not blown away until the cause of compromise had been rejected, and war alone remained, to be hailed perforce as the *Irrepressible Conflict*.

The South Carolina Rice Factor as Revealed in the Papers of Robert F. W. Allston

BY J. H. EASTERBY

In the heyday of rice culture on the South Atlantic coast the Georgetown district of South Carolina was the center of production.¹ Among the leading planters of the district was Robert Francis Withers Allston,² sometime governor of South Carolina, author of our best treatise on rice,³ and father of a daughter who carried on his work into the declining days of the industry and achieved something of a reputation through writings which describe her experiences as a rice planter.⁴ Every phase of planting, milling, and marketing is reflected in the abundant store of records which Allston preserved,⁵ and from this vantage ground—a rich

¹ Of the total United States crop of 187,167,032 pounds in 1859, Georgetown district produced 55,805,385. *Eighth Census, 1860, Agriculture* (Washington, 1864), 129, 185. In 1839 the district's proportion was even larger. *Compendium . . . of the Sixth Census, 1840* (Washington, 1841), 192, 359.

² At the height of his operations (1862) Allston owned nine plantations embracing more than six thousand acres. Additional holdings of timber, pasture, and other lands amounted to approximately nine thousand acres. At one time or another he managed the estates of five deceased relatives and friends. One of these was yielding in 1857 a gross annual return of \$31,479. Figures compiled from the Allston Papers. Allston's career is sketched in J. H. Easterby, "Robert Francis Withers Allston," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), I, 223-24.

³ Originally prepared for Edmund Ruffin, *Report of the Commencement and Progress of the Agricultural Survey of South-Carolina for 1843* (Columbia, 1843), and separately printed under the title, *Memoir of the Introduction and Planting of Rice in South-Carolina* (Charleston, 1843).

⁴ Patience Pennington [Mrs. Elizabeth W. Allston Pringle], *A Woman Rice Planter* (New York, 1913); Elizabeth W. Allston Pringle, *Chronicles of Chicora Wood* (New York, 1922).

⁵ These records were placed in the custody of the writer by the late Mrs. C. Albert Hill, another of Allston's daughters. After selections have been made for a publication sponsored

collection of papers and the geographical center of the rice industry—it is proposed to examine the relationship between the planter and the man who sold his crop, bought his supplies, and attended to a thousand odds and ends for him in the Charleston market. If the latter emerges in this instance in a light more favorable than that which has been shed upon other dealers in southern staples,⁶ it may be due to the ability of the Allstons to drive a bargain or to any number of other reasons. A generalization of the rice factorage system must await the careful study of further evidence.

Why Charleston, sixty-five miles down the coast, should have gained preference as a market over the port of Georgetown, which was situated within a few miles of the rice fields on the Waccamaw, Peegee, Black, and Santee rivers, has never been satisfactorily explained. Tradition, long accepted as historical fact, puts the blame altogether on a shallow harbor and a shifting bar,⁷ but closer study suggests that the stubborn resolve of Charleston to control the trade of the southeastern coastal plain may be an additional, if not a more important, reason. While the citizens of Georgetown were dallying with plans for a deepwater channel at the close of the eighteenth century,⁸ Charleston built the Santee Canal up to their very back door. Later the trade of their natural

by the Beveridge Fund of the American Historical Association they will be placed in the South Carolina Historical Society in whom ultimate ownership was vested by Mrs. Hill. Unless otherwise stated all citations to manuscripts are to the Allston Papers.

⁶ Cf. John S. Bassett, "The Relation Between the Virginia Planter and the London Merchant," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1901, I (Washington, 1902), 551-75; *id.*, *The Southern Plantation Overseer as Revealed in His Letters* (Northampton, Mass., 1925), Chap. XII; Alfred H. Stone, "The Cotton Factorage System of the Southern States," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XX (1915), 557-65.

⁷ Attention was called to Georgetown's shallow harbor by John Drayton in *A View of South-Carolina as Respects her Natural and Civil Concerns* (Charleston, 1802), 170 n., 207-208. A quarter century later Robert Mills elaborated this point, adding that "obstructing bars increase as cultivation releases more soil into the rivers." *Statistics of South Carolina, including A View of its Natural, Civil, and Military History* (Charleston, 1826), 557, 559-67. Ulrich B. Phillips, *A History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt to 1860* (New York, 1908), 6, 34, and Leila Sellers, *Charleston Business on the Eve of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, 1934), 6-7, accept this explanation. On the ability of Salem, Massachusetts, to overcome this kind of handicap, see Samuel E. Morison, *The Maritime History of Massachusetts, 1783-1860* (New York, 1921), 96-97.

⁸ Drayton, *View of South-Carolina*, Appendix and accompanying map.

hinterland was further drawn to Charleston by means of the steamboat and the railroad.⁹ And so, having failed to control the business of its outlying region, Georgetown was unable to support the large mercantile establishments which were necessary to an adequate handling of the crops of its immediate vicinity. ". . . there are no regular merchants [in Georgetown], with a few exceptions," wrote Robert Allston's mother in 1820, "and [these] are obliged to leave this Place every Summer."¹⁰ Some years later the editor of the Georgetown *Gazette*, in lamenting the passage of several weeks without the arrival of a single vessel from the North, remarked:

We begin to long earnestly for the "coming in" of our Yankee friends, with their apples, onions, cabbage, cheese, codfish and potatoes; and even, if they please, a little bacon. . . . The Barn-Yard Turkey is pleased to take the very centre of the dish, that the round Irish Potatoes may flank and front him, and also bring up the rear; and the wild Duck that feeds and flutters in the fields, is never so comfortable as when under a hot press of Weathersfield onions. But not to particularize, our friends bring us many acceptable things; and we say—God speed them.¹¹

Under these circumstances the planters of Georgetown district shipped their rice directly from the plantation wharves, or the neighborhood "pounding mills,"¹² to the countinghouses of Charleston, employing for this purpose during the early years of the century the small schooners of the Yankee visitors and others that were locally owned.¹³ In the

⁹ This advance of Charleston into Georgetown's back country is best told in Phillips, *Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt*, 83-91, 349-55. Sundry details are supplied by the Allston Papers.

¹⁰ Charlotte Ann Allston to R. F. W. Allston, March 2, 1820. The noticeable decrease each summer of merchants' advertisements in the Georgetown newspapers would seem to corroborate the latter part of this statement. On occasion, however, the factor advised the planter that certain commodities could be purchased more cheaply in Georgetown than in Charleston. Charles Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, October 25, 1815; November 14, 1816; March 12, 1818; March 19, 1819.

¹¹ Georgetown (S. C.) *Gazette*, September 15, 1826.

¹² After the rice had been threshed it was first passed between millstones for the removal of the outer husk and then placed in mortars and "pounded" by power-driven pestles to remove the still tightly clinging inner husk.

¹³ Elizabeth B. Pharo (ed.), *Reminiscences of William Hasell Wilson (1811-1902)* (Philadelphia, 1937), 18-19. The South Carolina names borne by several vessels regularly mentioned in the Allston Papers and in contemporary newspapers suggest that this traffic was not so largely in the hands of New England captains as Wilson says.

later period the steamboat began to encroach upon the sailing vessel.¹⁴

Some five hundred letters, covering the years from 1808 to 1867, and several account books of approximately the same period record business transactions between the Allstons and their agents in Charleston and other shipping points. With the exception, however, of the letters of Alexander W. Campbell, who acted as both factor and executor of the estate of Robert Allston's oldest brother during the years from 1834 to 1837, these documents relate principally to a firm established near the close of the eighteenth century by Charles Kershaw and continued through the next seventy-five years by a succession of partners under the names of Kershaw and Lewis; Lewis and Robertson; Robertson, Blacklock, and Company; and Thurston and Holmes.¹⁵ Except for a brief period during the War Between the States, this firm handled the greatest part of the Allston business.

Kershaw was an Englishman who came to Charleston shortly after the Revolution where he remained active in rice factorage until his death in 1835.¹⁶ The first letter from his hand shows him acting in 1808 as the factor of Robert's father, Benjamin Allston, Jr. On the death of Benjamin in the following year Kershaw, like Campbell in a later period, took up the duties of an executor in addition to those previously assumed.¹⁷ This arrangement remained in force for eleven years; thereafter Kershaw and his successors served the Allstons as factors only.¹⁸ Differences might be pointed out between the activities of the factor

¹⁴ The types of vessels are indicated in the "Marine News" columns of the Charleston and Georgetown newspapers. Both schooner and steamboat appear to have followed the "outside" or ocean route. The first made the run "during daylight"; the second reduced the time by four or five hours and was less dependent upon wind and tide.

¹⁵ These are the principal names under which the firm operated; others were used during brief periods. The continuity is certain in all except the last case; in this, references to certain records of Robertson, Blacklock, and Company in the possession of Thurston and Holmes seem to indicate a definite connection. Thurston and Holmes to Benjamin Allston, April 23, 1866. The date of dissolution of the firm has not been established.

¹⁶ Obituary in the Charleston *Courier*, August 8, 1835; Kershaw's will in Charleston County, Court of Probate, Will Book H, 141; information furnished by Mrs. G. T. Kershaw, of Charleston, South Carolina.

¹⁷ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, April 25, 1809.

¹⁸ On the division of the estate of Benjamin Allston, Jr., in 1819 the several heirs executed a bond of \$25,000 to Kershaw to protect him against the claims of creditors.

who was also an executor and those of the factor pure and simple, but it would be difficult to show that the zeal of the one was greater in his principal's behalf than that of the other.

The services performed by these agents of the Allston family well illustrate the accepted definition of a factor as one who "could, and in many cases did, do anything which the principal could do through an agent."¹⁹ Not infrequently the planter's children were entrusted to the care of the factor. When, for instance, young Robert was leaving for West Point in 1817, Kershaw arranged for his passage from Charleston. ". . . our city still remains sickly," he wrote to Mrs. Allston, "and although he has been taking medicine for his last illness he may not escape the malignant disorder which now prevails. Vessels are continually going to New York and I could get any of them to call at the Island [Sullivan's Island in Charleston harbor] and take Robert on board."²⁰ Later Kershaw sought in vain to gratify the mother's desire to place her youngest son with one of the Charleston business houses. "Merchants," he said, "will not take lads into their stores or counting houses without their parents find them in everything. . . . it is considered that what they learn in the stores is full compensation for their services."²¹ At a later time Alexander Robertson, who managed the Allston correspondence after Kershaw's death, had to report the death of a younger member of the family while attending school in Charleston.²² "What I did for our late Orphan Child," he wrote, "was no more than I felt bound to do. Could anxiety and care have kept her, she would now be with us. But it pleased God to call her. . . . I had everything done as though she was my own and discharged my last sad duty towards her by putting her in our private cemetery in St. Paul's church yard."

With his planting operations more or less continually expanding Robert Allston was a buyer rather than a seller in the slave market, but

¹⁹ Norman S. Buck, *The Development of the Organisation of Anglo-American Trade, 1800-1850* (New Haven, 1925), 6-7.

²⁰ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, October 7, 1817.

²¹ *Id.* to *id.*, March 12, 1818.

²² Alexander Robertson to Allston, November 14, 1838. Previously Robertson had advised at great length concerning the choice of a school for this child. *Id.* to *id.*, January 16, 1838.

on occasion he found it necessary to sell Negroes belonging to estates of which he was acting as executor. In every case, whether of purchase or sale, the transaction was arranged by his factors.²³ If a Negro was to be hired out in Charleston,²⁴ or placed at a trade, such as shoemaking²⁵ or barbering,²⁶ or put in the hands of a doctor for treatment that could not be had in Georgetown,²⁷ the arrangement was made through the same channel. The Negro boy James affords a case in point. He had been sent to Charleston to learn the shoemaker's trade. Kershaw reported in 1819:

I have seen Mr. Black; he will give only ten dollars per month for James to find him, but you must find him in clothes and shoes, pay doctor's accounts and allow for the time he is absent whenever you send for him to Georgetown either at Christmas or any other time. Mr. Black says he is a good workman and capable of turning out work equal to any of his colour, but he is so very indolent that he requires a very tight hand kept over him.²⁸

Plantation supplies were regularly purchased through the factor, and in addition he was called upon to procure every article that human taste could desire.²⁹ A shipment made in 1808 included a barrel of apples, a new cheese, a piano, and two kegs of nails.³⁰ When a woman's judgment was required in the selection of some piece of female apparel, the factor's wife was pressed into service.³¹ On one occasion Robertson wrote in desperation that his time and that of a friend during an entire day had been spent in vain search of a certain kind of carriage which

²³ Lewis and Robertson to E. F. Blyth, January 26, 1835; A. W. Campbell to Allston, January 7, 31, 1837; Lewis and Robertson to *id.*, April 8, May 8, 1837; Robertson, Blacklock, and Company to *id.*, January 13, 14, 1859; sundry entries in the Allston Account Books.

²⁴ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, March 16, 1816; December 23, 24, 1817; A. W. Campbell to Allston, July 14, 1837.

²⁵ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, December 30, 1817; February 2, 1819.

²⁶ Lewis and Robertson to Allston, April 24, 1837.

²⁷ Lewis, Robertson, and Thurston to *id.*, December 21, 1838; Benjamin Allston to Robertson, Blacklock, and Company, July 24, 1859.

²⁸ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, February 8, 1819.

²⁹ The variety is best seen in those account books which have survived and in copies of parts of others. The latter were prepared from the current account book kept by the factor and sent periodically to the planter.

³⁰ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, October 1, 1808.

³¹ *Id.* to *id.*, April 25, 1809; February 15, 25, 1815; February 7, 1817.

Allston had ordered, and that, as a last resort, he was sending his own as a substitute.³² Even furnishings for the parish church were bought by the factors,³³ and, when a new building was erected for Prince Frederick's, they were called upon to act as treasurer of the building fund.³⁴

Except in cases of large loans the factor was the planter's banker.³⁵ He carried his client's balance on deposit, using it, as need arose, in honoring drafts and in making purchases at the planter's order.³⁶ He bought bills of exchange,³⁷ gave advice on investments,³⁸ went into the market to purchase every form of property from bank³⁹ and railroad stock⁴⁰ to plantations,⁴¹ and voted his client's proxy at stockholders' meetings.⁴² He is even found on occasion going joint security on the planter's notes.⁴³ In one respect, however, the Allstons made less use of their agents than our knowledge of the factorage system in the antebellum South would lead us to expect. They do not appear to have

³² Robertson to Allston, June 20, 1837.

³³ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, February 25, 1819; Lewis and Robertson to Allston, March 25, 28, 1937.

³⁴ Robertson to *id.*, April 9, 1861, and statement which appears on the walls of the church.

³⁵ On occasion Allston borrowed from the Charleston banks the large sums needed for capital outlays (canceled bonds in the Allston Papers), but it is interesting to note that every bond claim against him at the time of his death was held by a private individual. Allston *v.* Allston, Charleston County, Office of the Clerk of Court.

³⁶ On the subject of drafts drawn presumably by clients whose balances were exhausted, Robertson wrote Allston on November 14, 1858: "We don't accept" is the old rule and one that we must adhere to—or we will soon become involved. You, however, know that we don't hold always to it, with old and well tried friends. Only to guard against——— we must hold out the principle, and trust our old friends will support us in the stand; for it is pretty clear their true interest to do so."

³⁷ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, May 24, June 22, 1810; May 5, 1823; Robertson, Blacklock, and Company to Allston, August 29, 1859.

³⁸ Lewis and Robertson to Blyth, June 19, 1835; Robertson, Blacklock, and Company to Allston, April 14, 19, 1859.

³⁹ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, June 22, 1810; April 5, 1823; Lewis and Robertson to Blyth, May 2, June 19, 1835; Lewis, Robertson, and Thurston to Allston, November 14, 1838.

⁴⁰ Lewis and Robertson to Blyth, October 12, 1835; Robertson to Allston, November 14, 1838.

⁴¹ Robertson to Allston, January 26, 1838; March 22, 1859.

⁴² Lewis and Robertson to Blyth, March 5, 1836; Robertson to Allston, November 17, 1838.

⁴³ Lewis and Robertson to Allston, February 9, August 17, 1837; Robertson, Blacklock, and Company to *id.*, March 2, 1859.

required the heavy advances between seasons usually regarded as a chronic evil of plantation finance. During the eighteen seasons covered by the account book of "R. F. W. Allston in Acct. Currt. with Kershaw, Lewis, & Co." the largest amount paid for interest on advances in any one year was \$134.68. In eight of these years, in spite of the fact that Allston was drawing heavily upon his returns for investment purposes,⁴⁴ the account shows a balance in his favor.⁴⁵

But in the final analysis the factor's most important service was the selling of the planter's crop, for on his success in this depended all other activities. Aided by the newspapers which carried every conceivable kind of information concerning the condition of the market,⁴⁶ the factor watched with eagle eye the ebb and flow of prices and advised his client accordingly.⁴⁷ Shipments, as we might expect, were heaviest during the weeks immediately following the harvest in August and September, but they continued with remarkable steadiness throughout the year.⁴⁸ The Allstons were among those who staggered their shipments with the

⁴⁴ At the time of his death Allston was carrying obligations somewhat in excess of \$255,000 (*supra*, n. 35). "It has been my custom when able," he tells us, "to pay off annually, all interest due, and an average of ten thousand dollars of principal." Charleston County, Court of Probate, Will Book N, 177.

⁴⁵ Kershaw, Lewis, and Robertson to Blyth, July 19, 1833; Lewis and Robertson to *id.*, January 5, February 29, 1836; *id.* to Allston, April 24, May 26, 1837. Allston's record in the management of his deceased brother's estate is equally impressive in this respect (Account Book of Estate of Genl. J. W. Allston in Acct. with A. W. Campbell), but other planters appear to have been less careful. On May 11, 1823, Kershaw wrote to Charlotte Ann Allston: "We have advanced to one friend or another all our disposable Funds and in place of receiving what we advanced, our Friends were in so much distress, occasioned by the low prices of produce, that in place of being able to return to us what they had borrowed they were in want of further help. It is in these times that our Business becomes very painful, we are compelled to refuse the assistance which we would willingly give."

⁴⁶ This included a daily list of rice cargoes arriving and departing, frequent summaries of the same covering periods of varying length, and price quotations and amounts of sales in both domestic and foreign markets. Files of the Charleston *Courier* and *Mercury*. That the newspaper price current was supplied to merchants in distant markets is revealed in letters of F. and C. Winthrop of Charleston to Moses Taylor of New York (Charleston Free Library).

⁴⁷ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, March 7, 1820; Lewis and Robertson to Blyth, August 5, 1836; February 5, 1838.

⁴⁸ This is clearly indicated in the newspaper lists of arrivals.

result that over a period of years the records show sales of some portion of their crop in every month.⁴⁹

En route from planter to factor the rice cargo appears to have been protected by no other form of insurance than a ship captain's agreement to make delivery unless prevented by "the Dangers of the Sea and River."⁵⁰ And seldom was it insured even after it reached the factor's wharf, for ordinarily it was sold on the day of its arrival.⁵¹ Sales were usually made at auction, for cash or payment within sixty days, to agents known as "rice buyers," who represented merchants in widely scattered markets.⁵²

Except for a short period, when he appears to have specialized in producing large quantities of seed for sale to other planters,⁵³ Robert Allston sold mostly clean rice. The former had been carefully threshed by hand.⁵⁴ The latter had been threshed by machine on the plantation and husked and pounded either at Waverly Mill, which Allston was managing as an executor, or at one of the several great mills in Charleston.⁵⁵ After assignment by the factor to one of many grades ranging from "inferior" to "strictly prime" and "choice,"⁵⁶ it was packed in barrels,⁵⁷ or tierces, of approximately 600 pounds gross weight.⁵⁸ Other

⁴⁹ Dates of sale are recorded in the Account Books.

⁵⁰ Captains' receipts of November 22, December 11, 1819; February 5, 1823. Cargoes were occasionally found to be short, but only one serious loss is reported during the sixty years of the records. Kershaw and Lewis to Charlotte Ann Allston, January 9, 1824; Lewis and Robertson to Blyth, August 16, 1836; Robert Thurston to Allston, November 23, 1837; W. P. Lea to *id.*, November 25, 1837; Thurston and Holmes to Benjamin Allston, March 30, 1867.

⁵¹ Lewis and Robertson to Blyth, October 12, 1835; March 1, 1838; A. W. Campbell to Allston, November 2, 1837; Lewis and Robertson to *id.*, October 17, November 16, 1837; March 20, 1838; Edward N. Thurston to Benjamin Allston, March 29, April 23, 1866.

⁵² Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, December 13, 1809; March 31, May 8, 24, 1810; July 30, 1812; April 19, 1823; Winthrop letters, cited *supra*, n. 46. Little light is shed by the Allston Papers on the trade after it reached the rice buyer.

⁵³ Account Books, 1837-1838, and orders for seed.

⁵⁴ For the merits of "hand-whipped" seed, see [Pringle], *A Woman Rice Planter*, 73-75, 79-81.

⁵⁵ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, October 1, 1819, and sundry accounts sales.

⁵⁶ Market quotations in the Charleston newspapers.

⁵⁷ Barrel was the common term, but tierce and cask were occasionally used. Robert Thurston to Allston, November 16, 23, 1837; Alexander McKenzie to *id.*, May 24, 1863.

⁵⁸ On this point, however, the factor advised: "Sales are often helped by the Barrels

planters, however, sold much rice in the rough or unhusked form.⁵⁹ Handled in bulk and reckoned by the bushel,⁶⁰ this was often preferred by foreign buyers, partly, it would seem, because the grain was thought to deteriorate if kept too long after husking⁶¹ and partly because mills in the markets for which it was destined were eager for the profits from processing.⁶²

On the completion of the sale of each parcel, no matter how small it might be, the factor rendered his client a detailed statement known as an "account sales." These vary so little in form that an analysis of one will explain the procedure followed throughout the whole period. On August 4, 1837, Lewis and Robertson advised Robert F. W. Allston of the sale of 69 barrels of clean rice ranging in weight from 621 to 707 pounds and 5½ barrels of "offal" (rice flour and small cracked grains), the total being the product of 1,568 bushels of rough rice pounded in Charleston at Nowell's Mill. Twenty barrels had been sold on July 25 to G. and I. Gibbon at \$3 13/16 per hundredweight; the next day 49 barrels were sold to C. Edmonston at \$3 7/8 per hundredweight; and on July 27 the 5½ barrels of offal were sold at prices ranging from \$3 5/8 to \$3 3/4 per hundredweight. The gross proceeds were \$1,706.89. From this amount the following charges were deducted:

Freight on rough rice from plantation to mill @ 6 1/4 cents	
per bushel	\$ 98.00
Freight on clean rice from mill to factor's wharf @ 25 cents	
per barrel	18.75

being heavy and weighing 700 Gro., for all Coastwise freights, and to France, is paid by the Barrel, whether it weighs 650 or 750 Gro. and is oftentimes a matter of consideration to shippers." Lewis, Robertson, and Thurston to *id.*, December 7, 1838.

⁵⁹ The term paddy, meaning rough rice, which is generally used in later United States *Census Reports*, does not appear in the Allston Papers.

⁶⁰ Details from sundry letters and accounts sales.

⁶¹ Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, December 13, 1809; Robertson, Blacklock, and Company to Allston, August 6, 1859. If necessary, however, rice could be stored for months and even years. Kershaw to Charlotte Ann Allston, September 20, 1815.

⁶² Ruffin, *Report . . . of the Agricultural Survey of South-Carolina*, 19-22. Ruffin asserted that the English tariff favored rough over clean rice in order to encourage mills in England.

Mill toll (7½ per cent of gross receipts exclusive of freight on rough rice)	111.56 ⁶³
Factor's commission (2½ per cent of gross receipts)	43.58 ⁶⁴
Cost of the barrels	28.75 ⁶⁵
Coopering	7.50
Landing and weighing	7.50 ⁶⁶
Storage of 5½ barrels of offal24
 Total	 \$315.88

The planter's return from this sale was \$1,391.01, or 81.5 per cent of the selling price. The remaining 18.5 per cent was distributed as follows: freight 6.8 per cent, milling 6.5 per cent, factorage 2.7 per cent, and miscellaneous charges 2.5 per cent. When the milling was done at the plantation,⁶⁷ this charge was diverted to the planter's account, thereby reducing the cost of preparation and handling to 12 per cent of the selling price. Otherwise the ratio between charges and net proceeds varies little throughout the period covered by the Allston records.

No precise statement of the annual volume of the Allston business can be made. It would be safe to say, however, that in the 1850's it exceeded \$60,000.⁶⁸ On this sum the factor's commissions would have amounted to \$1,620. He may have collected an additional \$200 or \$300 as interest on advances,⁶⁹ storage charges probably yielded a small amount; and the planter's balance, which the factor held for periods of considerable length, may have been used to his profit. It would be diffi-

⁶³ This appears to have been 7½ per cent of the receipts from 69 of the 74½ barrels after the freight on the rough rice and the planter's refund for the barrels were deducted.

⁶⁴ This was 2½ per cent of the gross receipts including the refund for barrels, hence approximately 2.7 per cent of the actual selling price of the rice.

⁶⁵ If supplied by the mill, barrels cost the planter 87½ cents each for whole barrels, 62½ cents for half barrels. In the sale he received a refund of 50 cents for each. This figure was the difference between the cost and the refund. An effort was made by the planters in 1837 to force the refund up to \$1.00, but this failed. Lewis and Robertson to Allston, October 17, 1837.

⁶⁶ The wharfage rate was fixed by law and was published in the almanacs of the day. Kershaw and Lewis to Charlotte Ann Allston, December 18, 1823.

⁶⁷ During most of the twenty-three years that Robert F. W. Allston managed Waverly plantation, its mill was in active service pounding the Waverly crop and those of near-by plantations. Its receipts in 1856-1857 were \$15,786.32. Account Book of the Estate of J. W. Allston in Acct. with A. W. Campbell.

⁶⁸ The net proceeds of the Waverly crop alone in 1856-1857 were \$15,203.92.

⁶⁹ The rate was 7 per cent.

cult to show that the factor, unless he were also acting as an executor,⁷⁰ took more than these rewards for his services. He may have accepted rebates from the merchants who sold him the planter's supplies, but, if he did, the evidence has been successfully concealed.⁷¹ He charged no commission on these purchases; nor is there any reason to believe that he charged brokerage on stocks and bonds which he bought, or premiums on bills of exchange, or fees of any other kind.⁷² On the whole it would seem that the rice factor was willing to perform many extra services in order to secure the business of selling the planter's crop. He probably had no large capital investment; at the most he owned a warehouse where his office or countinghouse was located.⁷³ If he had to borrow to make advances to his clients, he ordinarily used for collateral the rice that was constantly passing through his hands;⁷⁴ but unless he dabbled in other lines, the cause it seems of the failure of A. W. Campbell,⁷⁵ his obligations were never heavy. Robertson summed up the position of the rice factor when he said in 1837: "The accounts to-day from England are still worse, and more must go. I mean merchants. Factors have no right to fail."⁷⁶

The concluding letters of the factor's series in the Allston Papers tell an interesting story of the efforts to divert the rice trade into new channels during the War Between the States and to revive old practices in the years that followed. Upon the closing of the ocean route

⁷⁰ The usual commission in this case was 2½ per cent on receipts and 2½ per cent on disbursements.

⁷¹ For information on this point the writer has examined, in addition to Allston materials, the account books of Plowden C. J. Weston in the College of Charleston Library, and Mr. John dePerry has searched the Edward Frost records in the Library of Congress. None of these, however, are factors' accounts.

⁷² How the planter's profit compared with that of the factor is a difficult question. Concerning the former Allston wrote: "The profits of a Rice plantation of good size and locality, are about eight per cent. per annum, independent of the privileges and perquisites of the plantation residence." R. F. W. Allston, *Essay on Sea Coast Crops* (Charleston, 1854), 37.

⁷³ Campbell to Allston, May 13, 1834; Lewis, Robertson, and Thurston to *id.*, December 7, 1838; "Some Charleston Wharves," in *Year Book, City of Charleston, South Carolina, 1936* (Charleston, [1937]), 183-92.

⁷⁴ Lewis and Robertson to Allston, April 24, 1837.

⁷⁵ Campbell to *id.*, July 1, 1837.

⁷⁶ Robertson to *id.*, July 14, 1837.

between Georgetown and Charleston by the Federal blockade it was proposed to use the inland passage,⁷⁷ but this appears not to have been feasible. Georgetown still had no railroad connections,⁷⁸ and Allston was put to the limit of his resources. For a time he sent small amounts of rice by wagon to Kingstree on the Northeastern Railway.⁷⁹ Finding that the security of \$20,000 and the rental of \$100 per day that were demanded for a steamboat, which he proposed to charter, were prohibitive,⁸⁰ he built lighters which were soon being poled up the Peepee River to Mars Bluff, Society Hill, and Cheraw, and on Black River to his private station at Salters on the Northeastern.⁸¹ At Cheraw, D. Malloy and Son acted as his factor; at Florence, Alexander McKenzie; and at Wilmington, DeRosset, Brown, and Company. From Mars Bluff, L. Gilchrist offered the following bit of unsolicited advice: "I hope you may be able to send your flats up soon, for if you can get your rice in the hands of men who are true to the *South* it is best."⁸²

Such was the momentum given to this inland trade that it was continued successfully after Allston's death on April 12, 1864, and until the Federal occupation of the Georgetown district brought planting to a temporary halt. After that the trade gradually flowed back into the old channels. But in these later years the Allstons planted on a greatly reduced scale, all but one of their plantations having been sacrificed to the creditors of Robert's estate. Robertson, Blacklock, and Company appear either to have gone out of business or to have been reorganized by younger men under the name of Thurston and Holmes.⁸³

⁷⁷ Andrew Johnstone to *id.*, June 4, 1861.

⁷⁸ A line to connect with the Northeastern Railroad was under construction at the beginning of the war, but it was not completed until years later. Allston to Benjamin Allston, August 18, 1860; Adele P. Allston to Charles P. Allston, October 19, 1862.

⁷⁹ Allston to Adele P. Allston, December 3, 1861.

⁸⁰ Robertson, Blacklock, and Company to Allston, August 14, September 2, October 2, 1862.

⁸¹ Pringle, *Chronicles of Chicora Wood*, 27-30.

⁸² L. Gilchrist to Allston, October 3, 1863.

⁸³ The books of the former were sent to Columbia and there burned. Edward N. Thurston's references to these records suggest that he and his partner had taken over the accounts of Robertson, Blacklock, and Company. Robertson, Blacklock, and Company to Allston, October 10, 1862; Thurston and Holmes to Benjamin Allston, April 23, 1866.

Conflicting Cotton Interests at Home and Abroad, 1848-1857

BY THOMAS P. MARTIN

By the middle of the nineteenth century the cotton business in its various phases from planter to manufacturer and ultimate consumer had reached a stage where internal adjustments rather than rapid growth in any particular direction had become characteristic.¹ It seems appropriate, therefore, to consider the so-called cotton question and the activities of cotton interests during the next decade on a broader basis than merely that of British dependence on "the South" for "raw cotton supplies."²

Cotton was, it is true, the foundation of the clothing of the multitudes. It had superseded other textiles such as flax, silk, and wool to such an extent as to become a common necessity. Experiments with other natural fibers were being made, but none had met with commercial success; and the possibility of evolving an artificial fiber such as rayon had hardly occurred to anyone. A sudden, long-time deprivation of raw cotton would have worked great hardships and forced adjustments, the end and extent of which could not have been foreseen. It is undeniable that the greater part of the "trade" was dependent upon "the South" for the raw material. But the seriousness of this dependence could

¹ This paper was read before the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association at Lexington, Kentucky, November 4, 1939. It is a part of a larger work mentioned in the first footnote to the writer's "Cotton and Wheat in Anglo-American Trade and Politics, 1846-1852," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 293.

² *Ibid.*, 293-300; Frank L. Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy: Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America* (Chicago, 1931), Chap. I.

usually be discounted. As a force it did not operate continuously; frequently it was overshadowed; and sometimes it was plainly stimulated by outside influences, the origin and nature of which were also easily understood.

Indeed King Cotton "philosophy," together with other matters of economic dependence, was an important factor in American politics and foreign relations, occasionally invoked and ultimately made a basis of policy by the short-lived Confederate government. But it was not a serious danger to the regular flow of raw cotton to England. The chief danger seemed to lie, as John Bright pointed out in 1847, in the growth of the antislavery movement, which was likely to produce a sudden convulsion or civil war in the United States.³ The British cotton interest, however, with full knowledge of the effects it was producing in the United States, had long supported this movement; and the chances that that interest would ever change its attitude or policy with respect to slavery anywhere, least of all in the United States, were becoming less each day.

There are good reasons for taking the view that the chief problem of the cotton trade lay in the markets for manufactured goods rather than in the sources of supply of the raw material.⁴ Since the invention of the cotton gin and the discovery that the South had almost unlimited resources for cotton growing, prosperity in the British cotton trade had depended upon demand for yarns and cloths, which were at that time almost the sole articles of cotton manufacture. There were, of course, occasional exceptions to this general rule—short crops, deficient harvests and rises in the cost of food, financial crises, war scares, etc.⁵

³ Martin, "Cotton and Wheat in Anglo-American Trade and Politics," in *loc. cit.*, 297. David Christy, *Cotton is King* (Cincinnati, 1855), has been much noticed by historians; but it seems to have been merely a journalistic development of an old idea and to have had little discoverable influence other than that indicated by the sources cited in Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy*, 15-16.

⁴ London *People's Paper*, May 23, 1857, expressed this view in answer to propaganda put forth at the time of the organization of the British Cotton Supply Association. See also, n. 78.

⁵ On one occasion (1839) an attempt by Nicholas Biddle, General James Hamilton, and other American financiers to "corner" American cotton caused temporary embarrassment.

But in the end, if existing cotton goods markets were "fully supplied" or were unable from whatever cause to make purchases in normal volume, or if "over expansion" occurred in the manufacturing districts, new markets had to be found or developed, new kinds of cloth devised to meet changing demand or to arouse new wants; or, in extreme cases, old markets dead and unresponsive in good territory were to be broken up and revolutionized or renovated. All these processes were known to the trade and were more or less used, especially where means of resistance were weak.⁶

Of all consumers' market territories, the most troublesome and the least profitable were those where the slave trade and slavery existed. The slave trade, except the domestic traffic in the United States, caused intertribal wars for the capture of slaves to the great damage of all other business; while in the United States it was productive of abductions, kidnapings, arrests, and other disturbances which interfered with trade, especially in the border states and the southern ports. Slavery, though it had merits as a system of labor and might even increase staple exports, was even more objectionable. In the first place, it was demand for slaves that gave life to the slave trade; in the second, the prevalence of slavery dwarfed or stunted the consumers' market within the territory. "Slaves had no wants, but of rest—no desires, but to avoid the lash; and it was only the wants and desires of the comparatively few proprietors that caused a demand for the productions of other countries."⁷ In all this the trade of the South was no exception. In fact it appeared to be worse than it should be. As early as 1839 the subject of reopening the African slave trade was advocated in the South;⁸ and the smuggling of slaves along the southern coasts was believed to be one of the strongest factors in keeping that trade alive. Contemporary writings on plantation and slave management in the South baldly

⁶ A cynical view of "Manchester" activities on such occasions was expressed in the *Colonial Magazine and East India Review* (London, 1844-1852), XIX (1850), 478-84.

⁷ Report of a speech by Shuttleworth, in *Manchester Guardian*, June 2, 1821.

⁸ New York *Emancipator*, June 20, 1839, quoting an article in the New York *Daily Express* copied from the New Orleans *Courier*; used by the writer in "The Influence of Trade in Cotton and Wheat on Anglo-American Relations, 1829-1846" (Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1922).

proclaimed the economies which were enforced on the slave population; and Southerners boasted of the manufacturing carried on at home and in local cotton mills operated by slave labor.⁹ The export of "Negro cloth" from Great Britain to the United States had by 1838 practically ceased.¹⁰

Such was the situation about 1853, when the British cotton trade, apparently at the top of a cycle of prosperity which had run since 1849,¹¹ reached a precarious state. Cotton manufacturers had been greatly extended both at home and abroad;¹² markets for yarn and cloth were in many cases "over done"; and margins of profit at the current prices of raw cotton were so narrow that at times they disappeared altogether.¹³ Besides, inclement weather had raised apprehensions of deficient harvests with consequent rises in the costs of food.¹⁴ At such times it was exceedingly important to seek out every possible way of increasing demand for yarns and cloth as well as to broaden and develop sources of food and raw material. Otherwise there would

⁹ James D. Hill, "Some Aspects of Slavery, 1850-1860," in *South Atlantic Quarterly* (Durham, 1902-), XXVI (1927), 161-77, especially 168; Lewis C. Gray, "Economic Efficiency and Competitive Advantages of Slavery under the Plantation System," in *Agricultural History* (Chicago, 1927-), IV (1930), 31-47; Laura A. White, "The South in the 1850's as Seen by British Consuls," in *Journal of Southern History*, I (1935), 29-48.

¹⁰ Statement of John Benjamin Smith, president of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, cited by Thomas P. Martin, "The Upper Mississippi Valley in Anglo-American Anti-Slavery and Free Trade Relations: 1837-1842," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914-), XV (1929), 209, n. 9.

¹¹ Weekly reports on both the Liverpool (raw cotton) and Manchester (yarn and cloth) markets are available in the London *Times* and the *Economist* (London, 1843-), and also occasional analyses and summaries covering longer periods. Special studies by historians interpret and evaluate such contemporary reports; but it is to be kept in mind that these weekly, monthly, and yearly summaries, and the private papers of business houses, such as those of Baring and Rathbone, cited below, represent better what was known and thought at the time. For an interesting and valuable general compilation and study, see Arthur H. Cole, "Wholesale Commodity Prices in the United States, 1843-62," in *Review of Economic Statistics* (Cambridge, Mass., 1919-), XI (1929), 26-37.

¹² London *Times*, September 22, 1852, quoted in the *Economist*, X (1852), 1066.

¹³ Editorial article expressing concern over the American cotton crop, in the *Economist*, X (1852), 1092. Bad weather or an early frost might produce a disastrous rise in prices.

¹⁴ Baring Brothers and Company of London wrote private letters to Thomas W. Ward, their American agent at Boston, September 10 and December 17, 1852, describing damage to the harvest of 1852, the lack of fall sowing, and forecasting a considerable demand abroad for importations to supplement the British supplies in 1853. Copies of letters in Baring Papers (Archives of Canada, Ottawa).

be widespread curtailment of operations, an enormous increase of unemployment, and no profits.¹⁵

It was with all these things in mind that John Bright, a cotton manufacturer of Rochdale and a leader of the cotton interest in Parliament, wrote to Joseph Sturge of Birmingham, a corn dealer and veteran anti-slavery leader:

The *Slavery* question is deeply involved in what is now to be done [with reference to reform in India]. An intelligent American from South Carolina [William H. Trescott?], holding an official position, told me lately that the moment we could obtain Cotton from any other Country, that moment was the first great blow struck at American Slavery. I fully believe a wise & economical Govt. could so free the industry of that Country & so open its communications, that we might have Cotton in great quantity from it, so as materially to affect our position with regard to the States.

Bright wished to know whether the enemies of slavery in Great Britain could not therefore support his agitation for reform in British India.¹⁶ The appeal was significant. It was easy to foresee that the abolition of slavery in the United States would have profound effects—not alone in the checking of the African slave trade but also in opening the way for the resettlement of the South by numerous freemen and a beneficent revolution in the consumers' markets of the region.

Such considerations with reference to slavery were even more stirring and provocative in New England; for the slaveholding South was closer at hand and within the tariff walls of the United States. There "the Slave Power" was hated even more than the British West Indian slaveholding sugar interest of 1821 had been in Great Britain. The Yankees knew as well as did the British the differences between consumers' markets in the South and those in the free states; and they now understood how it felt to be deprived of sales of "Negro cloth" and other coarse cloths; for these articles, the staple of New England cotton

¹⁵ Strikes for higher wages and the delicate balance between demand and supply in the cotton cloth trade are discussed in the *Economist*, XI (1853), 757, 1073-74; the rise in the price of corn, *ibid.*, 768, 1073-74, and elsewhere in this publication.

¹⁶ John Bright to Joseph Sturge, March 27, 1853, Sturge Papers (in possession of his son, Joseph Sturge). See also, R. A. J. Walling (ed.), *John Bright, Diaries* (New York, 1931), 137-40.

manufacture, were being made to an alarming extent in the South itself. Indeed, during the last decade, while the North and the West had profited largely by the insistent Old World demands for bread-stuffs and provisions, the South depressed by the diminished demand for raw cotton and restive under the protective tariff of 1842 had turned to diversification; and many new coarse cloth cotton mills had appeared upon the streams near the cotton fields. These together with some old mills improved or rebuilt supplied an increasing part of the local demand and even shipped their yarns and goods to other markets;¹⁷ and southern railroad builders, seeing the strategic importance of western connections for the new southern industry, bent their energies to improving them.¹⁸ The return of prosperity to the South after 1848, with the increased demand for raw cotton abroad, did not check the development; and it was clear enough that it had come to stay.¹⁹ Politicians responded accordingly.

At first protectionists everywhere expressed delight at the rise of manufacturing in low-tariff sections of the country and predicted a corresponding change in public opinion in those sections in favor of

¹⁷ See Broadus Mitchell, *The Rise of Cotton Mills in the South*, in Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Historical and Political Science*, XXXIX (Baltimore, 1921), Chap. I; *id.*, *William Gregg, Factory Master of the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1928), *passim*; Robert R. Russel, *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism, 1840-1861*, in *University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences*, XI, No. 1, Pts. I, II (Urbana, 1923), 33-64, 206-209; Emory Q. Hawk, *Economic History of the South* (New York, 1934), 290-91. Victor S. Clark, "Manufactures during the Ante-Bellum and War Periods," in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, 13 vols. (Richmond, 1909-1913), V, 313-35, remains one of the best treatments of the subject, though Clark again wrote upon the subject in his *History of Manufactures in the United States, 1607-1860* (Washington, 1916), *passim*. The view of Edward Channing, *History of the United States*, 6 vols. (New York, 1905-1925), VI, 27, that "there were manufacturing industries in the South in 1850, and the capital invested and the amount produced were distinctly appreciable and in the decade preceding secession increased in equal proportion with those of the North," is interesting. See also, *ibid.*, 26-30.

¹⁸ Fletcher M. Green, "Duff Green: Industrial Promoter," in *Journal of Southern History*, II (1936), 29-37.

¹⁹ The New York (Weekly) *Evening Post*, June 6, 1850, published a long editorial on "Who Shall Protect the Protected?" In other words, if manufacturing capital should move into the South and West, as it appeared to be doing, what would it avail for New England manufacturers to seek a protective tariff? No tariff could protect them from the competition of the southern and western mills. The New Englanders, however, were asking for special protection, as will be seen below.

higher tariffs.²⁰ Abbott Lawrence in 1846 publicly addressed protectionist letters to William C. Rives of Virginia;²¹ John S. Skinner in 1848 established *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil* in Philadelphia to spread protectionist arguments through the South and the West;²² and in 1849 Amos Lawrence urged upon Robert Barnwell Rhett of South Carolina the importance of allowing some protection to fine goods manufacture in order that New England might engage in it, leaving the making of coarse goods to the South.²³

But the victory of the Whigs in the presidential election of 1848 and the increasing agitation of the slavery question made such co-operation as that suggested by Amos Lawrence impossible.²⁴ The Democratic "free trade" press, particularly that of New York, hailed the rise of cotton manufacturing in the South and West as proof that New England cotton manufacturers did not need protection and as a sign that the entire coarse goods manufacturing business was really shifting to the South.²⁵ The proslavery press on the other hand declared that southern cotton mill building was in retaliation against the "tolerance" of so much antislavery activity in New England, that the South would manufacture its own cotton, use slave labor in its cotton mills, and cease to trade with New England. In other words, if one may adapt

²⁰ See William Diamond's analysis of the orientation of a "national economist" in the South, in "Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist," in *Journal of Southern History*, V (1939), 501-26.

²¹ Abbott Lawrence, *Letters from the Hon. Abbott Lawrence to the Hon. William C. Rives of Virginia* (Boston, 1846), reprinted from the *Richmond Whig*.

²² See the *Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil* (Philadelphia, 1848-1857), I (1849), *passim*; John S. Skinner, the editor, to Amos A. Lawrence, January 20, 1850, Lawrence Papers (Massachusetts Historical Society Library, Boston).

²³ Amos Lawrence to Robert Barnwell Rhett, December 12, 1849, in William R. Lawrence (ed.), *Extracts from the Diary and Correspondence of the Late Amos Lawrence* (Boston, 1855), 274-76.

²⁴ William Gregg to Amos A. Lawrence, September 2, 1850, Lawrence Papers, wrote in reply to a query that "A reasonable tariff of protection would set everything right at this time, but unfortunately for the country, just when the South was ready to receive reasonable propositions on this head, your people of the North, East, & West raised up a bone of contention which has spoiled all."

²⁵ Numerous examples are available in the issues of the *New York Evening Post* and the *New York Herald* while the tariff question was under discussion.

a phrase which has since become famous, Southerners intended to make grass grow in the streets of Lawrence and Lowell.²⁶

Cotton mill expansion in the South during the late 1840's really went on at a disturbing pace; and envy of it in the older manufacturing sections of the North and East soon became clearly evident.²⁷ The oft-repeated statements emanating from southern editors to the effect that slave labor was to be exclusively employed in the new cotton mills from time to time projected or under construction were picked up by northern editors and repeated with inadvertent or deliberate exaggeration;²⁸ and the impression was generally spread around both in the North and in the South that southern-made coarse cloth was extending its competition beyond the local markets. At length the writings of General Charles T. James, a Rhode Island machinery manufacturer, provoked a controversy. To James's *Practical Hints . . . to Cotton Planters and Capitalists of the South* (published in part in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, November, 1849), advertising southern advantages for cotton manufacturing, Amos A. Lawrence undertook to reply, denying that such advantages really existed. But Lawrence's statements became the subjects of rebuttals from various sources (northern as well as southern) which effectually silenced him.²⁹

²⁶ See editorials in the *New York Herald*, May 1, 3, 1850; Philadelphia correspondence of the London *Morning Chronicle*, quoted in the *Economist*, VIII (1850), 564.

²⁷ "The Valley of the Mississippi," in the *Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, I (1849), 307-10.

²⁸ See erroneous headlining, "Manufacturing by Slave Labor," *ibid.*, 634.

²⁹ See Charles Tillinghast James's pamphlet, *Practical Hints to Cotton Planters and Capitalists of the South* (Providence, 1849); *id.*, "The Production and Manufacture of Cotton: With Reference to Its Manufacture in the Cotton Growing States," in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine* (New York, 1839-1870), XXI (1849), 493-502; [Amos A. Lawrence], "The Conditions and Prospects of American Cotton Manufactures in 1849," *ibid.*, XXI (1849), 628-33; XXII (1850), 26-35; James's rejoinder, "Culture and Manufacturing of Cotton," *ibid.*, XXII (1850), 184-94, 290-311; also, Amos A. Lawrence to Freeman Hunt, editor *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, November 1, 1849; January 9 (4?), February 19, December 3, 1850; *id.* to C. T. James, November 28, 1849; *id.* to John S. Skinner, editor the *Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, February c. 19, 1850; *id.* to J. E. Brooks, editor *New York Express*, May 15, 1850; *id.* to William Gregg, August 21, 1850; *id.* to William Burroughs, Jr., editor *New York Dry Goods Reporter*, January 13, 1851; Hunt to Lawrence, December 7, 1849; December 9, 1850; Skinner to *id.*, January c. 20, 1850; Gregg to *id.*, September 2, 1850; Burroughs to *id.*, January 16, 1851, Lawrence

In New England the shoe began to pinch in 1850. Whether because of the southern cotton mill supply of local coarse cloth markets and competition elsewhere or no, the coarse cloth trade in the North during the spring was so dull that manufacturers, faced by rising prices of raw cotton, began to lose money. By May the larger cotton mills at Lawrence and Lowell were suspending operations in part, and many of the smaller ones in Rhode Island were forced to close.³⁰ Before the end of the year the depression had become a severe one. Skilled operatives, faced with reduced incomes, longer hours, pressure for greater output per hour, etc., where they remained employed,³¹ and threatened by starvation where they were not, began leaving the country. Many took "the safety valve route" to the West; others emigrated to the South, where there were opportunities for employment as teachers and overseers and where the costs of living were less.³² The cotton manufacturers on the other hand turned to experiments with "raw foreign labor," the Irish immigrants, and to attract and retain them built Roman Catholic chapels near the mills at "Company" expense.³³

Thus, while measures of the Compromise of 1850, including the Fugitive Slave bill, were under discussion, a labor question affecting New England and the South was becoming acute in much the same way as did another a few decades later, when the use of child labor became objectionable. Partly in reply to Lawrence, in the controversy

Papers. Of the letters in this collection cited above, those written by Lawrence are copies; those to him, originals.

³⁰ New York *Herald*, May 1, 3, 16, 24, 28, 1850; Amos A. Lawrence to J. E. Brooks, editor, New York *Express*, May 15, 1850, Lawrence Papers ("The increase of machinery has been, at the South as well as at the North, in advance of the increase in the production of raw material"); *Economist*, VIII (1850), 564-66; *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXII (1850), 646-47; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, September 6, 10, 11, 1850; the *Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, III (1851), 358; New York *Observer*, December 7, 1850.

³¹ Caroline F. Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture: A Study in Industrial Beginnings* (Boston, 1931), 110-13, 230-31. By 1850 the margin of profit was about one half cent per yard of cloth; "the industry's prosperity . . . rested upon the exploitation of labor," but "with all this pressure to reduce labor costs . . . the manufacturers could not bring them down in relation to cost prices." *Ibid.*, 113.

³² See Joseph Schafer's interesting discussion of the question, "Was the West a Safety Valve for Labor?" in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXIV (1938), 299-314.

³³ Amos A. Lawrence to Samuel Hale, January 13, 1854, copy in Lawrence Papers.

mentioned above, William Gregg declared that the South had supplies of "labor, both white and black, at least 20 per cent cheaper than in New England, and with few exceptions as cheap as in any part of the world"; and later added that in the South slavery gave to "capital a positive control over labor . . . for blacks can always be resorted to in case of need."³⁴ Although Solon Robinson, "the most important agricultural writer of that period in the North," had already exposed Gregg as one who employed "freemen" in the South "because they are found to be *cheaper* than blacks,"³⁵ the North was not reassured and was prepared to believe that slavery in the South was debasing free labor even in the North. "A Friend of the Union in Pennsylvania" commented with obvious justice in July, 1850, that the "North sees its mills and furnaces closed, and its mines abandoned, . . . while the time of Congress is so exclusively occupied by the *fugitive slave* bill and other kindred measures, that there is no chance for considering the case of *fugitive freemen*."³⁶ But it remained for an editorial writer in the New York *Herald* to declare flatly:

We dislike the idea of drawing a comparison between the labor of the fair and virtuous daughters of the North and that of the blacks of the South, in the cotton mills. . . . We regret it; we have that sort of respect for the fair sex of our own race, which makes it painful to bring them to the same level with the colored races, though both may be employed in the same service.³⁷

There was solid basis for the feeling. Southerners were indeed proudly pointing out both to British and to Northerners, in retaliation it is true

³⁴ Mitchell, *William Gregg*, 72, 143. In this connection it is interesting to read a letter from J. Bigelow, of the New York *Evening Post*, to Charles Sumner, May 24, 1850, "I am advised that Webster under the influence of the milling interest is designedly withdrawing his support from the free soil interest and abandoning his opposition to the extension of slavery, on the ground that the manufacturers of New England will suffer by the restriction of slavery & their interests be promoted by its extension. This may be calumnious but the reason is a perfectly good one I think, for such as are unscrupulous enough to be governed by and to use it." Sumner Papers.

³⁵ Herbert A. Kellar (ed.), *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist*, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, 1936), I, ix, and Robinson's letter, quoted from the Washington *National Intelligencer*, May 10, 1849, *ibid.*, II, 213. This work was issued as Vols. XXI and XXII of the *Indiana Historical Collections*.

³⁶ In an article "On the True Causes of Existing Difficulties," in the *Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, III (1851), 39.

³⁷ Quoted in *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XI (1851), 319-20.

for criticisms of the system of slave labor, that they provided better living conditions for the slaves than wage earners enjoyed in the great industrial centers.³⁸

In many parts of the North and West enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 was found to be nearly impossible. Material reasons (not often mentioned by the historian who prefers to show the altruistic side) stand out on the record. Many thousands of Negroes, one eighth as many as were in the South, had found their places in free state economy.³⁹ Negro cooks and stewards, for example, were, if one may accept statements by Robert C. Winthrop, the only kind obtainable by masters of vessels in many northern ports; and these could not be seized without causing great inconvenience and expense to northern men.⁴⁰ Flights of large numbers to Canada disrupted valued business and domestic relations in the communities which they left.⁴¹ On the other hand, though there may have been beginnings of "white labor" jealousy of "the blacks" in the North, the return of a quarter-million "select" Negro laborers to slavery in the South was not lightly to be permitted. Those Negroes who had reached the North and freedom, as well as many who had always lived there, were energetic and in-

³⁸ Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 268; Gray, "Economic Efficiency and Competitive Advantages of Slavery under the Plantation System," in *loc. cit.*, 41-43. The menace of southern (not to mention slave-labor) manufacturing in the middle of the nineteenth century to northern, particularly New England, manufacturing may be considered analogous to that of colonial manufacturing to the British at the turn of the eighteenth century. See Curtis P. Nettels, "The Menace of Colonial Manufactures, 1690-1720," in *New England Quarterly* (Baltimore, 1928-), IV (1931), 230-69; Justin Williams, "English Mercantilism and Carolina Naval Stores, 1705-1776," in *Journal of Southern History*, I (1935), 169-85.

³⁹ Arthur C. Cole, *The Irrepressible Conflict, 1850-1865* (New York, 1934), 263.

⁴⁰ In Senate debate on the Fugitive Slave bill, August 23, 1850, in *Congressional Globe*, 31 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, 1629.

⁴¹ According to the New York *Weekly Herald*, October 3, 4, 5, November 1, 1850, the first attempts at enforcement had stirred out hundreds of Negroes where only two or three or a half-dozen fugitives were supposed to be located. See also, Works Progress Administration, *Annals of Cleveland*, 1851 (Cleveland, 1937), 417, No. 3073. In some cases northern employers successfully used the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 to secure the return of "running" apprentices. *Ibid.*, 1853 (1937), 212, No. 1476. The multigraphed volumes just mentioned are portions of a series which is intended to present a digest of Cleveland newspaper items in which local events were recorded or local opinion of national issues expressed. The completed project will include a volume for each year of the period 1818-1935.

telligent, had acquired some education and skill, and were able to enter the trades when the immigrating Irish, not all of whom were employable in New England cotton mills, forced them out of menial positions.⁴² To add them to that supply of the more desirable Negro labor retained (not "sold down" the coast or river) in the border and South Atlantic seaboard states, where cotton manufacturing was certainly making its way, might be disastrous. For it was but a step in the South from the plantation system with its domestic manufacturing to the factory system; and some planters with their slaves were already making it. Moreover, the historian has to consider that the North had less doubt than did the South, if any doubt existed, that Negroes could be used in industrial establishments.⁴³

Such were the things the common man had to think about if he were to save himself (that is, all laborers regardless of color) from slavery, as really became more evident during the next decade.⁴⁴ The capitalist was, of course, more independent. He could, if pushed to it, transfer his investments to the South or the West, as some of the more agile were already doing. In the main, however, he played the conservative part and endorsed the Great Compromise, including the Fugitive Slave Law, still hoping that southern leaders would turn a shade

⁴² See Leo H. Hirsch, Jr., "The Negro and New York, 1783-1865," in *Journal of Negro History* (Lancaster, Pa., 1916-), XVI (1931), 433-38. A. Grenfell Price made the interesting remark in "Refugee Settlement in the Tropics," in *Foreign Affairs* (New York, 1922-), XVIII (1940), 664, that "Americans and South Africans know only too well how dense colored populations, particularly when organized under the plantation system, can under-cut white workers, create 'poor white' problems, and even in some cases absorb the whites racially."

⁴³ Friends of the Negro often praised his intelligence, potential skill, and other qualities. A letter by J. Graves, a northern overseer in the cotton mill at Saluda, South Carolina, addressed to the editor of the *Columbia Telegraph*, May 18, 1849, announcing the successful employment of slave labor, appeared in the *Charleston Mercury*, May 24, 1849, and was quoted in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, issue of October, 1850, XXIII, 575-76, just as the Fugitive Slave bill became law by presidential approval on September 18. "A Southern Planter" [Nathaniel A. Ware] had suggested in his *Notes on Political Economy as Applicable to the United States* (New York, 1844), 30-34, that 400,000 slaves in the border states could easily be removed from unprofitable agriculture and put to manufacturing. See Diamond's analysis of this work, in "Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist," in *loc. cit.*, 511-26. See also, Mark Cockrill (of Tennessee), "Cotton Mills by Cotton Growers," in the *Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, II (1850), 421-26.

⁴⁴ During and after the presidential campaign of 1856.

more protectionist.⁴⁵ It turned out, however, that public opinion in the North was not united on the subject of protection. There was too little in common between New England cotton lords and Pennsylvania iron-masters;⁴⁶ while New York merchants, many of whom cared little for protection, were not disposed to co-operate with either. In fact, these merchants resented the lower quotations on cotton cloth in Boston and believed that "if Manufactories can be established South and West this market will become the depot of the surplus."⁴⁷ Consequently, no substantial progress on tariff legislation was made during the Taylor-Fillmore administration; and the Democratic victories of 1852 indefinitely deferred protectionist hopes.

This tariff disappointment, together with other sectional differences,⁴⁸ including continued reports of southern coarse cloth competition⁴⁹ and the desperate and disastrous strikes between native American labor and the millowners (begun with those at Salisbury and Amesbury, Massachusetts, in 1853),⁵⁰ seems to have disposed many northern business-

⁴⁵ The Cleveland *Daily True Democrat*, September 24, 1850, noted "a strong effort to silence the antislavery agitation by political trickery. . . . The South will support tariffs and bills asked by the rich northern land owners and politicians who helped them pass the recent legislation." Quoted in *Annals of Cleveland*, 1850, p. 407, No. 3012.

⁴⁶ Lawrence opposed Pennsylvania tariff proposals because they did not include protection for fine cloth manufacture. See copies of his letters of September 20, 1850, to Robert C. Winthrop, Samuel A. Eliot, and J. W. Edwards, Lawrence Papers. An ironmaster's view appears in Allan Nevins, *Abram S. Hewitt* (New York, 1935), 153-56. Hewitt found that "Southern and Western votes" were not to be had, except at the cost of a concession on railroad iron. He was indignant, but for traditional and material reasons did not abandon the Democratic for the Republican party in 1856, though it was intimated the new party would favor protection.

⁴⁷ William Burroughs, Jr., editor of the *Dry Goods Reporter* (title varies, New York, 1846-), to Amos A. Lawrence, January 16, 1851, Lawrence Papers.

⁴⁸ Henry H. Simms, *Life of Robert M. T. Hunter: A Study in Sectionalism and Secession* (Richmond, 1935), 95-99.

⁴⁹ "Production of Cotton Goods," in *United States Economist and Dry Goods Reporter*, XII, (1853), 416; J. Harold Easterby, "The Charleston Commercial Convention of 1854," in *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXV (1926), 194; Robert R. Russel, "The Economic History of Negro Slavery in the United States," in *Agricultural History*, XI (1937), 316; *Littell's Living Age* (Boston, 1844-), XLV (1855), 55, quotes a British opinion that the cotton trade was not indigenous in the northern states but might become so in the South "where the cotton is produced, and Negro fingers could as well work it as cultivate it." Some historians have apparently been misled by the fact that political newspapers ceased mentioning cotton manufacturing in the South after the presidential election of 1852.

⁵⁰ Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 294-96.

men to view more favorably the antislavery agitations and policies which they had hitherto condemned. Anyway, in 1854, when Douglas introduced the Nebraska bill, purposing to repeal Section 8 of the Missouri Compromise and thus to open the way for extension of slavery into vast new territories in the West, a surprising number rose as one man to protest;⁵¹ while some gave more than a little help to the emigrant aid societies for the "free" colonization of Kansas. Could it have been partly because consumers' markets in the West present and prospective were at stake? Or was it Eli Thayer's imagination, when he frankly declared in the "Prospectus" of the New England Emigrant Aid Company⁵² that

The enterprise opens commercial advantages to the commercial states just in proportion to the population which it creates, of free men who furnish a market to our manufactures and imports. Whether the new line of States shall be free States or slave States, is a question deeply interesting to those who are to provide the manufactures for their consumption.⁵³

Whatever the case, Thayer clearly echoed the British cotton interest attitude towards slavery and complemented the Appeal of the Independent Democrats which earlier in the year (January 22) had denounced Douglas' proposal as "part and parcel of an atrocious plot to exclude from a vast unoccupied region, immigrants from the Old

⁵¹ New York *Evening Post*, January 30, 31, 1854 (the Tabernacle meeting); Allan Nevins, *The Evening Post: A Century of Journalism* (New York, 1922), 249; Fred H. Harrington, "Nathaniel P. Banks," in *New England Quarterly*, IX (1936), 634-46; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, February 24, 1854 (Faneuil Hall meeting, presided over by Samuel A. Eliot, and run by such stalwart protectionists as Nathan Appleton, Abbott Lawrence, Robert C. Winthrop, and George S. Hilliard); Amos A. Lawrence to S. H. Walley, May 12, 1854, copy in Lawrence Papers ("Where is the spirit that led us to volunteer to shoot the abolitionists & free soilers & support the law? . . . It's pretty much gone already: this will crush it all out").

⁵² John Carter Brown of Rhode Island was president of this company and Amos A. Lawrence, treasurer. See Samuel A. Johnson, "The Genesis of the New England Emigrant Aid Company," in *New England Quarterly*, III (1930), 95-122.

⁵³ Boston *Daily Advertiser*, May 12, 1854; Eli Thayer, *A History of the Kansas Crusade: Its Friends and Foes* (New York, 1889), 32: "My themes were the commercial, industrial, and economic disadvantages of slavery. These arguments were effective with the Northern people."

World and free laborers from our own States, and convert it into a dreary region of despotism, inhabited by masters and slaves."⁵⁴

Meanwhile, the British cotton trade and the rest of the British nation were considering anew the question of the food supply, which had been raised by the inclement weather of 1852-1853.⁵⁵ The high prices of food were causing not only strikes for higher wages and increased costs of manufacturing; they were limiting the purchases of manufactured goods by the masses who had small incomes.⁵⁶ But the question was broader than that. The repeal of the Corn Laws (1846-1849) had indeed released the nation from dependence upon its own uncertain and insufficient harvests, in so far as those laws had been barriers; and it had since been learned that the conditions of foreign supply were not altogether safe and satisfactory. Of the total amount of corn (wheat) which had to be imported (roughly a quarter of the yearly need), about half came in nearly equal amounts from Russia and from the United States; and these were variable fractions so large, especially when the British and the western European harvests were poor, as to have great effects on prices. A diminution of one from whatever cause,

⁵⁴ *Independent* (New York, 1848-1928), VI (1854), 34; William O. Lynch, "Population Movements in Relation to the Struggle for Kansas," in *Studies in American History Inscribed to James Albert Woodburn* (Bloomington, Ind., 1926), 385. See also, the documents relating to Frederick Law Olmsted's later efforts to engage the interest and aid of the British cotton manufacturers, in Percy W. Bidwell (ed.), "The New England Emigrant Aid Company and Cotton Supply Associations: Letters of Frederick Law Olmsted, 1857," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXIII (1918), 114-19.

⁵⁵ The British and Continental harvests suffered in quality rather than in quantity; much of the grain was unfit for human consumption. See reference to the Baring Papers, *supra*, n. 14. J. T. Danson published a study, "On the Fluctuations of the Annual Supply and Average Price of Corn, in France, during the Critical Periods of 1792, 1814, 1815, and 1848," in the Statistical Society of London, *Journal* (London, 1838-), XIII (1850), 152-67, and thought his findings not only confirmed the aphorism that "the world is much ruled by the belly," but strongly suggested that "the history of prices (especially as it regards the food of the people,) may, in order of practical importance to mankind, take precedence of the history of politics."

⁵⁶ *Economist*, XI (1853), 1074, 1351-53, 1361-62. One conclusion was that, if strikes had not cut down production, there would have been an accumulation of stock and lower prices. See also, C. F. McCay, "Cotton Trade of the World, 1853," in *De Bow's Review*, XVI (1854), 337-43, quoted from *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXVIII (1853), 40-47.

except competition, raised demand for a corresponding increase of the other (on the assumption that production could be increased or a greater portion spared from home consumption); and this made dependence upon that source the more telling.⁵⁷

It was of course more irksome and galling to be dependent upon a foreign nation than upon one's own resources, especially to the Conservatives in British politics who had long used arguments for national self-sufficiency in support of the Corn Laws. By 1852 these Conservatives asked, "Can we say that we are independent for a year together, when either of these powers, by simply closing their harbours, can reduce us to scarcity—the two together to famine prices? . . . Both . . . were at war with us at the same time in 1811;—are their dispositions now so very friendly, and our interests and theirs so little at variance, that we can rely upon the like thing not occurring again?"⁵⁸ Under the circumstances which then prevailed—a poor harvest was in prospect just as the cotton trade was reaching a peak from which there could easily be a severe decline—few could say that abundant supplies of cheap food were less important than correspondingly abundant and cheap supplies of raw cotton.⁵⁹

Britain's grain trade was really in a critical condition. Whatever might be said regarding the friendly disposition of the United States, the competition of American grain was already retarding at times the flow of Russian grain to British markets.⁶⁰ Improvements in harvesting

⁵⁷ See John B. Lawes and Joseph H. Gilbert, "On the Home Produce, Imports, and Consumption of Wheat," in Royal Agricultural Society of England, *Journal*, Ser. II (London, 1865-1889), IV (1868), 359-96, for a general view. At times France exported large amounts of grain to Great Britain; but general climatic conditions over western Europe and over the British Isles ran much the same. Very different climatic conditions might occur any time in Russia and the United States.

⁵⁸ In a general article entitled "Gold—Emigration—Foreign Dependence—Taxation," in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (Edinburgh, 1817-1905), LXXII (1852), 215-16.

⁵⁹ The protectionist Conservatives were not, however, able to carry the country with them in the general election of 1852.

⁶⁰ See Vernon J. Puryear, *England, Russia, and the Straits Question, 1844-1856*, in University of California *Publications in History*, XX (1931), 102, n. 65; 126, n. 163; *Economist*, XI (1853), 60, 116-17; *United States Economist*, XII (1853), 327-29, quoting a London "Report" of January 20. Compare with Frederick W. Merk's statement that "not until after the Civil War . . . could the United States export wheat successfully

and transportation were coming rapidly, and the stimulation of another series of bad harvests in the Old World like that of 1845-1847 might bring about an American grain supremacy in British markets similar to the American raw cotton supremacy which had prevailed since about 1823.⁶¹ Such fate was not to be courted or tempted, if it could be avoided.⁶² On the other hand, Russia was adopting what the British considered an unfriendly role, pushing interests greatly at variance with those of Great Britain, interfering with the grain trade of the lower Danube (partly because it competed with her Baltic and Black Sea trade), and in general seeking to control that region and to encroach upon Turkey. Thus the third source of British food supply, potentially important, was definitely endangered;⁶³ and the cotton in-

to European markets," in "The British Corn Crisis of 1845-46 and the Oregon Treaty," in *Agricultural History*, VIII (1934), 108.

⁶¹ The author of "The Recent Growth of the United States of America," in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, LXXV (1854), 703, asked, "What is the quantity of grain which such a people [Americans] will be capable of sparing for the consumption of Europe, when the capabilities of their soil are brought more fully into exercise?" He continued, "the promise of the Free-Traders to lay [the fertile valley of the Mississippi] alongside of Manchester appears to have been realized." *Ibid.*, 710. Turning his attention to cotton, he noted that the American Secretary of the Treasury had declared, "More than anything else this product made other nations, even the most powerful, dependent on the United States of America," and commended this remark "to the serious consideration of statesmen and politicians." *Ibid.*, 711. See also, the opinions of Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, 2 vols. (London, 1837), I, 307, on the relationship of the Mississippi Valley and the Corn Laws.

⁶² J. R. McCulloch's accounts of the British foreign corn trade, in his *A Dictionary, Practical, Theoretical, and Historical, of Commerce and Commercial Navigation* (London, 1869), 426-60; and "Corn Laws and Corn Trade," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (8th ed., London, 1853-1860), VII (1854), 374-404, were antiquated and misleading so far as American participation was concerned.

⁶³ See Puryear, *England, Russia, and the Straits Question*, 131-35; *id.*, *International Economics and Diplomacy in the Near East, A Study of British Commercial Policy in the Levant, 1834-1853* (Stanford University, 1935), Chap. VI; "The Cost of the Coalition Ministry," in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, LXXV, (1854), 501; "The Russo-European Embroilment," in *Westminster Review* (London, 1824-1914), CXXI (1854), 143; "The War—and What is to Come of It," in *British Quarterly Review* (London, 1845-1886), XX (1854), 248-71; "Manchester and St. Petersburg," *ibid.*, 504-27; "The War and the Ministry," in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, LXXVI (1854), 599-618. "By the occupation of the Danubian provinces, the Czar would gain possession of the keys of a vast and prolific granary, which in the case of war would of course remain absolutely shut; and he no doubt calculated on this as a material element in the question of our neutrality. It is rather curious to observe that even at the present time the Russian

terest, usually referred to as "Manchester," for this reason as well as because of the more general threat to British communications with the Near East joined with those who were willing if it were needful to make war upon Russia.⁶⁴ The United States, they confidently declared, in answer to objections that importation of grain from Russia would be stopped by war, could easily double its exports and make up the difference. Unfortunately, they were too optimistic.

The depression in the British cotton trade of 1853-1854 grew deeper after the outbreak of the Crimean War, until July, when there came a temporary recovery which lasted through August.⁶⁵ By that time it was seen that the year was indeed turning out to be a hard one. The harvest was "not good" a second consecutive time, the Russian grain was cut off by the war, stocks on hand were being exhausted, and it was clear that extra importations must be got if possible from the United States. Reports of severe droughts in the South and in the West disturbed the markets both of raw cotton and of food.⁶⁶ Sales of manufactured goods both at home and abroad rapidly declined; and the trade settled down into what was soon described as a great and unusual depression,⁶⁷ one which continued through the remainder of the year and until March, 1855. During this dreary time the manufacturers had to play a well-nigh desperate game. With little regard for profit they contrived by "dumping" their goods on distant markets, including North American, at reduced prices, to keep their operatives

journals are harping upon this idea." *Ibid.*, 602. The Conservative press was, of course, making the most of its opportunity to jibe at the free traders.

⁶⁴ The editorial articles in the *Economist* for 1853 and 1854 illustrate the course of British cotton trade opinion with reference to war with Russia. See also, John Morley, *The Life of Richard Cobden* (Boston, 1881), Chap. XXIV; Walling (ed.), *John Bright, Diaries*, Chap. VIII.

⁶⁵ See "Changes in the Cotton Trade during the Last Five Years," in *London Times*, January 19, 1855; "Trade of 1854," in the *Economist*, XIII (1855), 4-8; "The Cotton Crop of 1854," in *De Bow's Review*, XVIII (1855), 321-27; and the current reports of 1854 in those magazines.

⁶⁶ Baring Brothers and Company to Grinell, Minturn, and Company of New York, April 18, July 15, August 19, 28, September 22, 1854, copies in the Baring Papers; *United States Economist*, XV (1854), 42, 243-44, 382.

⁶⁷ *Economist*, XII (1854), 928, 1173-74; *United States Economist*, XV (1854), 390, 411.

employed.⁶⁸ With reference to their jingoistic attitude towards Russia, they went through something like a mellowing process until, even in the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, they were willing to tolerate John Bright's denunciation of the government for continuing a war which kept the Russian grain out of England.⁶⁹

The worst was yet to come. The death of the Czar of Russia, news of which was received at the end of February, 1855, caused a speculative rise in the prices of raw cotton (based on hopes of an early return to peace) which mounted until June 4. When raw cotton reached seven pence per pound, the equivalent of fourteen cents in New Orleans, spinners balked, and business in the cotton markets came to "a full stop."⁷⁰ There had been no revival of demand in the cloth markets; and the purchase of raw cotton at such prices could not be continued, except at a ruinous cost. In July they began purchasing again at lower prices, but on a hand-to-mouth basis until the end of the year. In December the situation became a little easier; there were some indications of a return of steady demand in the cloth markets.

It is easy to imagine correctly what was happening contemporaneously in the cotton manufacturing districts in the United States. The high prices of food and raw material operated in this country as in Great Britain to reduce demand for cotton goods and to make their manufacture at a profit more difficult. The added embarrassment of an influx ("dumping") of British and other foreign goods on American shores and of a drought which in many places stopped the water wheels made it practically impossible to continue operations, except on the basis of such economies, driving of labor, and reduction of wages as constituted an industrial war of attrition on native American labor.⁷¹

⁶⁸ On February 17, 1855, Barings privately cautioned their Liverpool house to watch closely the proceedings of spinners. With absence of demand for cloth for China, Bengal, Bombay, and the United States, and "a slack trade at home, we see no other course but short time" and lower prices for raw cotton. Baring Papers.

⁶⁹ "Mr. Bright and the Depression of Trade," in the *Economist*, XIII (1855), 165. Bright was quoted as having said, "Before two years are over you will shoot your own fellow citizens in your own streets." The *Economist* agreed that such a thing might happen!

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, XIII (1855), 487, 615, 631.

⁷¹ See contemporary accounts in the *United States Economist* and *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*. Ware, *Early New England Cotton Manufacture*, 268, 294-98, and Marcus L.

Again in the South conditions were not so bad. The climate was milder, and there were other ways of making a living. Southern cotton manufacturing in comparison with New England lost little ground during this period of extreme difficulty. There were comparatively fewer marginal mills to be forced out of existence; and those that remained kept up their share of nearly one eighth of the total consumption of raw cotton in the United States. Occasionally they sent their yarns and cloths into the northern markets, whereupon the facts were duly advertised. Above all they kept themselves reasonably clear of debt and continued the payment of dividends which New England investors and manufacturers could envy.⁷²

The southern cotton growers, on the other hand, seem to have continued to enjoy, except during an occasional slump in the prices of raw cotton, what was called prosperity,⁷³ a state which had been their lot most of the time since 1848. But the planters were a restless group and complained generally of the shortage of the labor supply and the high prices of Negro slaves, advocated a reopening of the African slave trade, and talked about turning from cotton culture to "various naval stores, timber, and manufacturing enterprises."⁷⁴ They raised much of

Hansen, "The Second Colonization of New England," in *New England Quarterly*, II (1929), 549-52, present the results of careful studies of the period. H. W. Gair of New York, in a letter to William Rathbone, Jr., of Liverpool, February 10, 1855, reported that Manchester was glutting the New York dry goods market. This letter is in the Rathbone Papers, Liverpool, which were used by permission of Mr. Frank Rathbone.

⁷² See "Southern Manufacture," in the *Washington Union*, June 8, 1854; statement of Senator Philip Allen of Rhode Island, quoted in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXXIV (1856), 511; New York *Shipping List*, quoted in *De Bow's Review*, XIX (1855), 596-99; *supra*, n. 18; *Littell's Living Age*, LIII (1857), 43, concerning an improvement of cotton manufacturing machinery on a plantation near Mobile.

⁷³ The New York *Evening Post* exclaimed, January 5, 1855, that "notwithstanding the general depression of the business world, both at home and abroad, the cotton planters 'still live.' " They were about to hold another convention, at New Orleans, and purposed to divert their cotton from Liverpool to the Continent, setting up perhaps a central depot in Berlin!

⁷⁴ "Official Journal" of the third Memphis convention, June 6-9, 1853, in *De Bow's Review*, XV (1853), 256-74. This document conveys the air of a contented, happy assemblage of prosperous men. W. J. Carnathan, "The Proposal to Re-Open the African Slave Trade in the South, 1854-1860," in *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXV (1926), 410-29. In Herbert Wender, "The Southern Commercial Convention at Savannah, 1856," in *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (Savannah, 1917-), XV (1931), 182, it appears that A. L. Scott

their own food and animal supplies when the prices of such commodities in the West became abnormally high.⁷⁵ The short crops of cotton were advantageous, after 1852, while the cloth markets presented no aggressive demands; for spinners everywhere were obliged to purchase raw cotton at sellers' prices. During most of the period of the Crimean War the British bids in New Orleans were far below the "asked" prices, and sales usually did not take place until the former were raised.⁷⁶ The continuance of this state of affairs over a period of many months of depression and its later recurrence, when the demand for cloth returned, finally led cotton manufacturers to declare that it was the slaveholding southern cotton planters who absorbed all the profits of the trade.⁷⁷ Of course, the British cotton speculation of March-June, 1855, mentioned above, was a perfect windfall for the South. Cotton growers and their business associates—bankers, factors, merchants, etc.—wherever cotton was held were put into a good position to demand the highest prices obtainable for the new crop of 1855,—all of which came just in time for the recovery incident to the rising demand for cloth.

Before the spring of 1856 the British cotton trade was on tiptoe. The slight evidences of improvement in the cloth markets, first noticed in December, had shown more than a cumulative increase during January and February; in March recovery became unmistakable; and in April business picked up with a steady acceleration. Enthusiasm for the continuance of the Crimean War, which had reached a stalemate,

of Virginia contended that northern free labor would not be able to compete with well-trained Africans and that the South would in time, as history has since shown, assume a position of very great and permanent strength. See also, Hill, "Some Economic Aspects of Slavery," in *loc. cit.*, 161-77.

⁷⁵ Avery O. Craven, "The Agricultural Reformers of the Ante-Bellum South," in *American Historical Review*, XXXIII (1928), 302-14; E. Merton Coulter, "Southern Agriculture and Southern Nationalism before the Civil War," in *Agricultural History*, IV (1930), 77-91; Charles M. Thompson, in *American Economic Association, Papers and Proceedings*, 1926 (Evanston, 1927), 11-12.

⁷⁶ See William Mure's reports and reports of others from New Orleans, in various issues of the *Economist*. Mure was sometime British consul in New Orleans.

⁷⁷ This was part of the propaganda of some of those prominent in the organization of the British Cotton Supply Association (April, 1857). See "The Cotton Dearth," in *British Quarterly Review*, XXVI (1857), 416-48.

no longer existed;⁷⁸ and the government was well advised to bring it to a close as soon as possible; also, to take good care not to get into another war with the United States, with which government a great deal of friction had arisen. The question of the cloth markets had disappeared for the time, and that of adequate supplies of raw cotton had again come to the fore. This was no time for a severance of relations with the main source. The South was jubilant, apparently suffering not at all from the "inferiority complex" which has since been ascribed to her by some historians.

In conclusion, it may be said, therefore, that British dependence upon the South for supplies of "raw cotton" was not the sole or even the principal moving force in courses which civilized peoples followed with reference to slavery in the United States. King Cotton diplomacy was indeed an incident. Chattel (slave) labor "black outs" of vast and potentially important "free consumers'" market areas; avowed capitalistic use of "black" slave labor clubs over "poor white" cotton mill operatives in the South; devastating forced labor competition of southern industrial enterprise (even in its infant stage) with that of the North which would in turn affect that of Great Britain and all northern Europe; actual invasion of the North and West by "fugitive slave" hunters who naturally would and did make "excuse-it-please," horrible, and intolerable "mistakes"; attempted applications even in the northern and western states of the Fugitive Slave Law to "running apprentices," white as well as black; industrial depression; persistent southern "free trade"; and the ominous threat to stifle rising industrial democracy and trade unionism—what else could not be mentioned!—these were some of the factors which we are beginning to consider and to understand. They were, of course, best exemplified in the conflicting interests of the world's cotton trade.

⁷⁸ Russia had not succeeded in establishing her hold upon the Danubian provinces. On March 14, 1856, the London *Journal of Commerce* remarked that the importance of those provinces as a consumers' market was growing and that they were paying for what they got in grain. Quoted in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXXIV (1856), 732.

Economic Conditions in the Confederacy as Seen by the French Consuls

BY GORDON WRIGHT

Of the thirty-nine nations with consular representatives in the South in 1861, France ranked second only to Great Britain in importance.¹ French consuls resided at Richmond, Charleston, and New Orleans; there were vice-consuls or consular agents at Galveston, Baton Rouge, Mobile, Key West, Savannah, Wilmington, and Norfolk.² From 1863, when the British consuls were expelled, the French reports are of unique interest; they furnish the most complete and regular source of comment by foreigners on the situation in the Confederacy.³

Until 1937 the French consular correspondence was inaccessible to scholars. This new source of information includes two parallel series of reports, sent to the commercial and the political divisions of the ministry of foreign affairs. Although there is some overlapping, most of the information on economic conditions is contained in the series *Correspondance commerciale*. Virtually all the reports emanate from the consuls in Richmond, Charleston, and New Orleans. Vice-consuls and con-

¹ Research for this study was made possible through a fellowship of the American Field Service Association.

² The Galveston consular agent, Benjamin Théron, was ordered to leave in 1863 by the Confederate government and was not replaced. Several of the vice-consulates also remained vacant during a large part of the war. At Mobile Nicholas G. Portz died in 1863 and was not replaced. Key West, Savannah, and Wilmington were also unrepresented by 1865.

³ On the expulsion of the British consuls, see Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., *The British Consuls in the Confederacy* (New York, 1911). The British correspondence has been fully utilized in Frank L. Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy: Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America* (Chicago, 1931).

sular agents were expected to correspond with one of the three consuls, through whom their information reached Paris.

Alfred Paul at Richmond was the only consul to serve throughout the four years of the war. Although stationed there for several years before 1861, he showed no prosouthern bias. He opposed secession, and warned his government against counting on the South's low-tariff promises.⁴ His reports reflect a Gallic temperament that tended toward enthusiasm when things were going well, toward pessimism in times of southern defeat. In June, 1861, the fervor of secessionism in Richmond swept him into an assertion that "the revolution must be accomplished"—which drew a dry marginal comment in Paris, "It seems to me that M. Paul is becoming thoroughly partisan and impassioned."⁵ But this mood soon passed as economic stress increased and his native penchant for irony reasserted itself.⁶

At New Orleans Count E. de Méjan was a frank partisan of the Confederacy. He had been at this post since 1856, and had absorbed the southern point of view. Although late in 1860 he repeatedly expressed fear that economic disaster would follow secession, he began to find excuses for separation once it had occurred.⁷ He contrasted the calm in the South with the violence in the North, showed deep hostility toward "Mr. Lincoln and his party," and described the cause of the Union as hopeless.⁸ The West, he confidently predicted, would soon see that its real interest lay with the South.⁹ He insisted from the beginning that

⁴ Archives des affaires étrangères, Correspondance commerciale des consuls, Alfred Paul to Edouard-Antoine Thouvenel, Richmond, IV, No. 246, March 25, 1861. Unless otherwise indicated, all manuscript references below are from this series. The name of the addressee of consular reports, the minister of foreign affairs, will henceforth be omitted. Thouvenel held this position until September 15, 1862, and Edouard Drouyn de Lhuys thereafter.

⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 259, June 4, 1861.

⁶ Typical of Paul's temperament was his sarcasm when the Governor of Virginia begged for calm in January, 1861: "In this country, one need only be president or governor to lose all influence immediately." *Ibid.*, No. 231, January 9, 1861. A few days earlier he had spoken sardonically of "this strange people ready to commit suicide in the midst of an unprecedented but solely material prosperity." *Ibid.*, No. 226, December 22, 1860.

⁷ Count E. de Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 91, November 28, 1860; No. 95, January 9, 1861.

⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 109, April 29, 1861.

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 111, May 17, 1861.

the tariff question was an earlier and more important cause of secession than slavery.¹⁰ This theory soon evolved into a full-fledged economic interpretation. Méjan declared commercial independence to be the major aim of the South: "the war of conquest undertaken by the North," he wrote, "is meant much less to maintain the union than to defend its threatened and greatly imperiled financial and commercial interests." He accused the Federal government of long neglecting the commercial development of the South. For example, appropriations for improving the lower Mississippi had always been "ridiculously insignificant." The North's real desire, he concluded, was to ruin all southern ports and force all southern and western products to be shipped by rail to Philadelphia and New York.¹¹

It was not surprising, therefore, that friction developed between Méjan and General Benjamin F. Butler after northern arms had captured New Orleans. The Consul's *exequatur* was withdrawn in 1863, and France was thenceforward represented by M. Fauconnet, chancellor of the consulate. He, too, had been in New Orleans for many years, and was unfriendly toward the northern conquerors.¹²

The Charleston consulate experienced the greatest turnover during the war. S. de Belligny de St. Croix was replaced in August, 1861, by Baron Durand de St. André. The latter in turn departed hastily on leave in 1863; his place was filled by Arthur Lanen, a clerk from the New York consulate.¹³ These officials took a more objective view of the

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 98, February 5, 1861; No. 99, February 12, 1861.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, No. 120, June 22, 1861.

¹² Méjan was bitter at his ejection. He declared that Benjamin F. Butler had bribed one of his servants, who probably told the General some fables in payment. Méjan's final report included a brief appraisal of Butler: "Endowed with an extraordinary capacity for work and with great promptitude of decision, with unparalleled energy, he could render great services to the cause which he has embraced, if his crafty lawyer's mind and his native malice, along with that instinct of despotism which is nowhere so violent as in the American republican, who scarcely knows the control of laws, did not make of him an agent more dangerous than useful." *Ibid.*, XIV, No. 172, January 23, 1863.

¹³ Arthur Lanen's title was given as *élève-consul*. For details of the dispute over Lanen's right to represent France at Charleston when appointed from a consulate accredited to Washington, see Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., "The French Consuls in the Confederate States," in *Studies in Southern History and Politics Inscribed to William Archibald Dunning* (New York, 1914), 93-95.

South, for they had had no opportunity to put down roots there. Lanen in particular was severely impartial, and reported facts with seldom an opinion.

As for the vice-consuls, they were frequently long-time residents of the United States. An example was the French agent at Mobile, Nicholas G. Portz, who had been in the South for twenty years. He condemned the "inconceivable war" waged by the North, and concluded: "The mighty sword of France must show its point one of these days to protect the Confederation. Such are our hopes."¹⁴

Woven through most of the consular reports during the war were references to the blockade. Although the three consuls realized that it was comparatively leaky, all of them agreed that its effects on the South were far out of proportion to its technical effectiveness.¹⁵

Early in 1861 Paul at Richmond predicted that no blockade could seriously concern a great agricultural region like the South.¹⁶ He soon changed his views, however. As early as July he pronounced the blockade effective so far as Virginia ports were concerned, and blamed it for the shortage of munitions and equipment.¹⁷ "The effects of the blockade," he declared,

are being sharply felt during the last few weeks. Imported goods are rising in price in a crushing manner. . . . But the population complains of only one thing: of being unable to get either arms or munitions. These things have been replaced by arming the soldiers with bowie knives. . . . The use of this weapon contributed a great deal to terrorizing the ranks of the northern troops in the battle of Manassas. . . .¹⁸

He admitted the ease with which ships could reach southern ports; "but

¹⁴ Archives des affaires étrangères, Correspondance politique des consuls, Portz to Drouyn de Lhuys, Etats-Unis, XI, September 22, 1862. So few vice-consular reports exist that it is impossible to judge the attitude of most of these agents toward the South.

¹⁵ Owsley, emphasizing the ineffectiveness of the blockade, has contended that it was a "doubtful advantage" to the North. *King Cotton Diplomacy*, 290. On the other hand, see Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*, 6 vols. (New York, 1905-1925), VI, 519-21; James G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston, 1937), 651.

¹⁶ Paul, Richmond, IV, No. 254, May 9, 1861.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 264, July 19, 1861.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 268, August 3, 1861.

it is enough that the blockade, effective or not, be proclaimed, maintained as a war measure affecting the interests of other nations, for the regular flow of commerce to be stopped. This is what has happened."¹⁹

Paul scoffed at the South's King Cotton philosophy. "They imagine that the world cannot go on if the blockade of Confederate ports continues. It is true that if this blockade is not raised shortly, the Confederate states themselves will have great difficulty in going on."²⁰ As the year 1862 arrived he was no more optimistic. "The blockade is stifling. It dries up every resource. Nothing is left. *There is not even any paper to make treasury notes*; the fact is known, admitted."²¹ Two weeks later he pronounced the blockade at last completely effective: "Today all seems lost for the South. . . . Nothing can save her, it seems, save a foreign intervention which would doubtless bring with it grave complications."²²

Although gloom was not so deep at Charleston, St. André admitted that the blockade had brought distress. "It is true," he wrote, "that fifty-one ships have entered the port of Charleston and about a hundred that of Wilmington since the declaration of the blockade, but they have brought nothing, since most of them were only engaged in the coasting-trade. Still, they had to force the blockade, and what they have done foreign vessels might attempt in turn."²³ In January, 1862, St. André reported the first cotton sent to Europe by way of Nassau, confirming the fact that the blockade was not effective. The arrival of the English steamer *Ella Warley* in full daylight with a cargo of munitions was sufficient proof of this.²⁴ But though these cotton shipments slipped out safely, the Consul granted that the blockade had done two things. First, it had helped disrupt the southern transportation system, which had been based largely on the use of river steamers; and second, it had brought the threat of famine. "This [threat] is due especially to the blockade," he wrote;

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, V, No. 274, November 2, 1861; No. 301, April 15, 1862.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 285, December 19, 1861.

²¹ *Ibid.*, No. 287, January 22, 1862.

²² *Ibid.*, No. 288, February 10, 1862.

²³ Baron Durand de St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 2, August 18, 1861.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 10, January 7, 1862; No. 11, January 16, 1862.

from this point of view at least, there is no doubt that it has been effective. Everything has been lacking for a long while and, due to an apathy peculiar to this people, they have done nothing to procure what they need so badly. The presence of American cruisers along the coast does not prevent ships from entering or leaving, but one or two houses have monopolized this commerce, without their example having encouraged analogous enterprises. . . .²⁵

Count Méjan at New Orleans considered the blockade important chiefly because it prevented the arrival of foodstuffs by sea from Texas.²⁶ He mourned also the inability of the wine ships from Bordeaux to elude the blockaders.²⁷ But Méjan clearly realized that cotton exports had been cut off by the South's voluntary embargo rather than by the blockade. While emphasizing the fact that the Confederate government had not expressly forbidden export of the fiber, he pointed out that the factors refused to advance enough money to the planters to permit shipment of their cotton from the plantations to New Orleans. The obvious purpose was to force European intervention. Yet even in 1861 seven small vessels carried cotton to Havana, and a thriving trade across the Mexican frontier was being carried on.²⁸

Consul Paul in Richmond was also aware of the South's strategy, and found it a mistaken one. He declared:

The government has several times manifested the intention to deliver no merchandise and to permit exportation by no ship before the end of the blockade. The pretension is strange to say the very least, especially from a nation which is trying to prove that the blockade is often forced, which is in greatest need of imported goods, and which will soon have its warehouses encumbered with its products. The idea of sending back empty the ships which arrive loaded with necessities after having run the risks of war, is sheer nonsense.²⁹

²⁵ *Ibid.*, No. 20, April 6, 1862. The Consul added that privation and fear of bombardment had driven most of the population of Charleston and Savannah into the interior. Within a few weeks four fifths of Charleston's citizens had departed in order to avoid the fate of New Orleans. St. André expected that the authorities would burn the city rather than let it fall into northern hands. *Ibid.*, No. 23, May 3, 1862; No. 24, May 25, 1862.

²⁶ Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 133, November 12, 1861; No. 145, April 17, 1862. The overland haul, Méjan said, was too long and difficult, considering the lack of roads.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 124, July 18, 1861.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 127, August 9, 1861; No. 135, December 16, 1861; No. 136, December 18, 1861.

²⁹ Paul, Richmond, V, No. 274, November 2, 1861. By March, 1862, 35,000 guns and 24,000 pounds of powder had been received, but the pessimistic Paul feared it was already too late. *Ibid.*, No. 295, March 23, 1862.

By 1862 the Confederates also became convinced that their policy had failed. Dire need brought new tactics. Several Richmond officials informed Paul that "if no cotton has arrived in Europe recently, that is because no ships have been sent to carry it. . . . Furthermore, to suppose that no cotton would be found in the ports of the Confederate states is a mistake; . . . it is kept in the interior to shelter it from the enemy, but . . . it will be brought to the ports whenever ships come to take it."³⁰

The new policy marked the inception of blockade-running on a large scale. Charleston and Wilmington were the centers of this commerce. As mirrored in the Charleston reports, it showed an irregular increase until late in 1863. During the quarter from April to June, 1862, thirty ships left Charleston and ten entered.³¹ The proportion of captures was low throughout 1862; yet the Confederate government had to pay 400 per cent of the invoice price of goods, while private business paid 1,000 per cent.³² By March, 1863, twelve ships were making regular trips to Nassau. Auctions of the cargoes drew traders to Charleston from all over the South.³³ Consul Lanen reported that from the beginning of the war to May 31, 1863, total figures at Charleston gave 77 arrivals and 151 departures; 42,053 bales of cotton had been shipped out. He was told that a first voyage not only paid for the ship and cargo but gave a profit as well. Lanen deplored the activity of speculators, who bought up the goods imported and demanded outrageous prices for them. As a result a number of cargoes lay unsold in various ports.³⁴

But all was not harmony in the South on the question of illegal commerce. Especially in Georgia were dissenting voices heard. The Georgians condemned blockade-running as the source of southern ills: it had augmented the premium on gold, they said, and prevented Europe from being forced to recognize the Confederacy. Consul Lanen had no patience with these criticisms of a commerce so valuable to the South.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 301, April 15, 1862.

³¹ St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 27, July 6, 1862.

³² *Ibid.*, No. 35, January 29, 1863.

³³ *Ibid.*, No. 39, March 15, 1863.

³⁴ Lanen, Charleston, VII, No. 3, June 22, 1863.

Underlying the attacks, he thought, was

that rivalry which has long existed between Georgia and Carolina; . . . the former views rather spitefully the immense profits which her neighbor derives from foreign commerce and which she cannot share. Probably if the port of Savannah offered blockade-runners the same facilities as Charleston, the Georgians would find excellent arguments to prove that their profits fit in perfectly with the requirements of the most scrupulous patriotism. . . .⁸⁵

The golden era of blockade-running, however, was of short duration. In the autumn of 1863 Lanen wrote that a new Federal attack against Charleston had almost cut off its commerce. And with the arrival of the new year he reported the port of Charleston closed since the Federal success at Morris Island.⁸⁶ While other sources show that the runners continued to operate, especially through the Gulf ports,⁸⁷ references to the blockade virtually disappeared from the French reports during the remaining months of the war. True, the Mexican border trade continued to thrive to the very end; but it was of small importance to the Confederacy as a whole.⁸⁸ However incomplete the blockade may have been, the French consuls remained convinced of its severe effects upon the South. In December, 1864, Paul could still write: "It is evident that the thing which weighs most heavily on this country, the thing which is slowly crushing it, is the blockade."⁸⁹

France's main interest in the South lay in cotton and tobacco; hence the consuls devoted much attention to facts and figures relative to these commodities. During 1861 the European oversupply of cotton and the southern voluntary embargo created a static situation. The cotton remained on the plantations; cultivation of the new crop was continued

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* Georgians also asserted that the North was first to profit by these cotton exports. Lanen replied that of 26,412 bales exported from Nassau since January 1, 1863, only 2,545 bales had gone to the northern states.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 6, September 5, 1863; No. 10, January 6, 1864. Lanen exaggerated the extent of the northern navy's "success" and its effect on the blockade-runners. Cf. Randall, *Civil War and Reconstruction*, 591.

⁸⁷ Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy*, 267 ff.

⁸⁸ Fauconnet, New Orleans, XV, No. 231, March 4, 1865. Many of the foreigners in New Orleans moved to Matamoras, the "new Eldorado."

⁸⁹ Paul, Richmond, VI, No. 402, December 10, 1864.

with promise of a large yield.⁴⁰ The consuls confined themselves to speculating over the possibility of a negotiated peace or of European intervention.⁴¹ Méjan was alarmed by news that the British were considering the development of cotton plantations in their colonies. He painted a dark picture of the added power which this would give to England, the chief rival of France: "I am certain that this unfortunate possibility has not escaped Your Excellency, and that it is up to us to prevent it by every means which our influence can furnish."⁴² Méjan was plainly hinting at some form of intervention.

As the war continued and European stocks of cotton dwindled, the French government became increasingly concerned about southern crop conditions. The South turned in 1862 from an embargo policy to one of burning cotton and limiting crops, perhaps with the object of hastening European intervention.⁴³ The French consuls were kept well informed of this destruction, but apparently they did not regard it as an effort to intensify the cotton famine. They viewed the burning of crops as a purely emergency measure, carried out when there was imminent danger of capture by Federal troops.⁴⁴ This was the case on the sea islands near Charleston just before Sherman's occupation; it was true also in the Mississippi Valley after the fall of New Orleans.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 2, August 18, 1861; Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 111, May 17, 1861; No. 124, July 18, 1861.

⁴¹ Méjan expected an early solution on the basis of separation, because the North and West were suffering as much as the South. *Ibid.*, No. 127, August 9, 1861. None of the consuls believed that the cotton shortage would force Europe to intervene.

⁴² *Ibid.*, No. 111, May 17, 1861.

⁴³ Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy*, 44 ff.

⁴⁴ Paul admitted that some extremists, angry because of Europe's inactivity, had talked of legislating against the cultivation of cotton and tobacco "in order to preoccupy Europe"; but their plan was not adopted. Paul, Richmond, V, No. 287, January 22, 1862; No. 295, March 23, 1862. There had also been talk in 1861 of government purchase of all crops in order to provoke Europe into intervention. At that time Paul wrote: "The key word of the situation, Monsieur le Ministre, is this: 'The Confederation of the South counts on Europe.'" Paul, Richmond, IV, No. 259, June 4, 1861. But this measure, too, had never progressed beyond the stage of agitation.

⁴⁵ St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 10, January 7, 1862; No. 26, June 25, 1862. St. André estimated that 80 per cent of the stock, amounting to a million bales, had been burned in the Mississippi Valley. Méjan's figures were only one fourth as large, but were submitted a month earlier. On the sea islands Federal troops were able to scrape together only "one small shipload."

The limitation of acreage likewise sprang from necessity alone, in the opinion of the consuls. The year 1861 had yielded bumper harvests of cereals in Virginia and Louisiana, sugar in Louisiana, and cotton everywhere. But sugar, tobacco, and cotton were worse than useless when they continued to pile up in the plantation warehouses. Louisiana's sugar markets were cut off; prices dropped, demand was low.⁴⁶ It was only natural that staple-crop acreage should decrease. In the lower Mississippi region Méjan expected only a one-third yield of cotton for 1862. There was likely to be a similar drop in Virginia tobacco, according to Paul. St. André predicted that the cotton harvest in the Carolina region would be almost nonexistent.⁴⁷

But the task of substituting foodstuffs for staple crops was less simple than it seemed. "In spite of the high prices attained by all products of the soil," wrote St. André, "the planters hesitate because slave labor is everywhere more or less disorganized, and because in the presence of so uncertain a political future, they fear that they will be unable to harvest what they have sown." A further obstacle was the broken-down transportation system with its exaggerated rates of haul.⁴⁸ In Virginia the presence of large armies contributed to the difficulty.⁴⁹

Gradually, however, food production expanded. Lanen estimated that the acreage devoted to wheat, corn, and potatoes in the eight states east of the Mississippi almost tripled during the war.⁵⁰ The South Carolina legislature in 1863 finally decided to place legal limits on the acreage of cotton, since speculation in that commodity was causing its cultivation to be extended at the expense of cereals.⁵¹ In Virginia, on the other hand, a proposed law for limiting tobacco was coldly received by the entire population as an infringement on the principle of freedom of commerce.⁵²

⁴⁶ Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 133, November 12, 1861.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 145, April 17, 1862; Paul, Richmond, V, No. 310, July 2, 1862; St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 16, March 22, 1862.

⁴⁸ St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 16, March 22, 1862.

⁴⁹ Paul, Richmond, V, No. 310, July 2, 1862.

⁵⁰ Lanen, Charleston, VII, No. 15, May 6, 1864, gave the following figures: 1860, 10,600,066 acres; 1862, 13,950,000; 1863, 17,200,000; 1864, 29,550,000.

⁵¹ St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 37, February 25, 1863.

⁵² Paul, Richmond, V, No. 333, March 15, 1863.

When one considers the paucity of official statistics on the cotton crop and the stock on hand, the French consular estimates appear reasonably accurate. In answer to an inquiry from Paris late in 1864, Consul Lanen undertook a personal investigation. He interviewed a number of prominent South Carolina proprietors, and reckoned from their statements that the ratio of the 1864 harvest to that of 1860 would be 6 to 150. This meant a total of 14,000 bales in South Carolina in 1864. Applied to all the southern states, his ratio gave a grand total of 208,000 bales for 1864. Lanen was sure that this figure was too low, for Texas had suffered less from the war than had the other states. The only fact beyond dispute, he concluded, was that each year of the war had brought a decrease.⁵³

Fauconnet at New Orleans was more sanguine; he estimated the 1864 total at 500,000 bales, and credited Texas alone with 100,000.⁵⁴ But Paul was told by officials at Richmond that there would be virtually no harvest in 1864 except for a little in Texas.⁵⁵ The stock on hand at the end of the year was judged at two million bales by Paul, three million by Fauconnet. This suggests how much destruction had been carried out during the war; for the highest estimate of wartime exports through the blockade was placed by Paul at almost 1,000,000 bales, most of which he thought had gone across the Mexican border.⁵⁶

New Orleans was occupied by Federal troops from April, 1862, so that conditions there can hardly be correlated with those in the rest of the South. Before the city fell Louisiana had begun to turn from her staple crops of sugar and cotton to the raising of foodstuffs.⁵⁷ The

⁵³ Lanen, Charleston, VII, No. 23, January 19, 1865. Lanen submitted the following totals: 1861, 3,500,000; 1862, 1,000,000; 1863, 800,000; 1864, 300,000 to 400,000. Cf. the statistics in J. A. B. Scherer, *Cotton as a World Power* (New York, 1916), 420. They are slightly higher for the first two years, slightly lower for the last two.

⁵⁴ Fauconnet, New Orleans, XIV, No. 225, October 21, 1864.

⁵⁵ Paul, Richmond, VI, No. 403, December 28, 1864.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* This estimate resembles Owsley's recent calculation, which places the total of blockade-run cotton at 1,250,000 bales. *King Cotton Diplomacy*, 289. Cf. the figure of 541,000 bales to Europe, long accepted as accurate. James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the Final Restoration of Home Rule at the South in 1877*, 7 vols. (New York, 1893-1906), V, 409.

⁵⁷ Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 145, April 17, 1862.

northern command checked this tendency, yet failed to restore plantation production. Much of the 1862 crop rotted in the fields for lack of harvest hands. The Negroes who remained refused to work, so that three fourths of the sugar was lost.⁵⁸ Acting Consul Fauconnet became almost melodramatic after a journey through the Louisiana countryside:

Everything in this once animated region shows deep traces of conquest, of disorganization, and of ruin. The dwellings are mostly depopulated and some are entirely abandoned. Silence reigns where scarcely a year ago was the bustle of labor; the countryside offers the very image of desolation, one would think that a poisoned breath had passed by and destroyed all animal and vegetable life. Covered with brambles and roots, it passes before one's saddened eyes in solitude and abandonment, and the canes which remain standing, stiffened by the cold, give evidence of what would have been the harvest of 1862, which the shortage of labor caused thus to perish. . . .⁵⁹

The Federals attempted to run many plantations, but fate seemed to be against them. In 1863 the sugar crop was lost because of lack of field hands.⁶⁰ In 1864, when some progress had been made toward organizing a free labor system, the cotton harvest was almost entirely destroyed by caterpillars. The high price of cotton had caused the diversion of most of the sugar acreage, so that 1864 was a disastrous year.⁶¹ It was no wonder that the end of the war found Louisiana completely ruined.

The subject of money and banking was another to which the consuls devoted much attention. Reports on the South's financial status were certain to be of interest to prospective investors or buyers in Europe. Although they admitted that the Confederacy was operating in the face of grave difficulties, the worldly-wise Frenchmen blamed southern statesmen for many errors. "Financial science is still very backward in this country," wrote Méjan from New Orleans, "and in this regard as in many others, there are few men big enough for so difficult a situation."⁶² After observing the expedients of three years Consul Paul

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, XIV, No. 167, December 14, 1862.

⁵⁹ Fauconnet, New Orleans, XIV, No. 178, March 21, 1863.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 199, October 9, 1863; No. 201, October 23, 1863.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, No. 220, September 3, 1864; No. 224, October 12, 1864.

⁶² Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 129, September 27, 1861.

scoffed in disgust, "Peace alone can do more for the Treasury of the Confederate States than all the financiers of America—who, in any case, are audacious speculators rather than profound men able to raise the credit of a government riddled with debts and cannon balls."⁶³

New York had long been the nation's banking center before 1861. It was only natural, therefore, that secession should bring a crisis in the South. In New Orleans Consul Méjan reported:

the activity of the banks has almost ceased; the funds which are deposited in the New York banks were in fact seized on the 24th of this month by order of the Federal government, but released at the suggestion of influential financiers who have interests here either in capital or in real property, and who feared, not without reason, that this seizure made in the North would be followed by an analogous seizure in the South. . . .⁶⁴

But this fraternal gesture left the Southerners still short of specie. Their reserves were soon exhausted by the purchase of Confederate bonds. Consul Paul enthusiastically supported a proposal whereby the government would issue enough treasury notes to buy one third of all southern crops. This, he thought, would provide a solid foundation for the government's credit, and would give all holders of the treasury notes a material interest in maintaining the Confederacy. Furthermore, the government might realize large profits on the sale of their commodities. Paul foresaw only one possible objection: "It will be said to the government of the Confederate states: 'But you are becoming a merchant.' To which the government replies: 'Why not?'"⁶⁵

The proposal was not adopted, however, and the South continued to exist as best it could.⁶⁶ As early as June, 1861, the New Orleans banks

⁶³ Paul, Richmond, VI, No. 385, August 1, 1864. When Confederate Secretary of State Judah P. Benjamin ventured to criticize northern finances late in 1864, Paul declared: "Mr. Benjamin talks like a banker without credit who would say that Messrs. de Rothschild owe far too much money on current account." *Ibid.*, No. 398, November 18, 1864.

⁶⁴ Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 109, April 29, 1861.

⁶⁵ Paul, Richmond, IV, No. 259, June 4, 1861.

⁶⁶ The government did accept produce in part payment for a \$100,000,000 bond issue. John C. Schwab, *The Confederate States of America, 1861-1865: A Financial and Industrial History of the South during the Civil War* (New York, 1901), 12 ff. Further produce loans were made later in the war, but the government never became a large-scale holder of cotton.

were in a state of semisuspension and could no longer pay in gold;⁶⁷ by July paper money had depreciated 10 per cent; and by September all Confederate banks had stopped specie payment.⁶⁸ With the disappearance of coins came the issue of small paper notes. In New Orleans, according to Méjan,

there is not a grocer, a wine merchant, an omnibus company which has not issued paper with which the city is flooded today. This country alone could offer the spectacle of such a circulation, which offers no real guarantee and yet which everyone accepts, either through necessity, or due to that absolute confidence which so well characterizes the American population.⁶⁹

Consul Paul found the same condition in Virginia, where "paper money, manufactured by everyone, circulates supposedly at par, down to the five-cent bill signed by nobody knows whom." Confederate paper had dropped 30 to 35 per cent within a few months, but Paul added: "The fact is . . . that this paper . . . represents zero every place in the world except in the Confederate States where it is imposed, and that if the North ever arrives at its ends, everyone will be almost literally ruined in the South."⁷⁰

Conditions may have been discouraging at the end of 1861, but the consuls were to see them far worse. For four long years their reports showed a monotonous downward trend in southern finances. Constant borrowing, inflation, declining confidence—the story is familiar enough. At Richmond paper money eventually fell to 35 to 1; at Charleston, 42 to 1.⁷¹ Real property and slaves increased greatly in value, for everyone wished to get rid of Confederate currency. At Charleston values tripled in spite of the danger of bombardment.⁷²

When the Richmond Congress finally decided to force conversion of its notes, reducing the interest rate and deflating the amount of paper

⁶⁷ Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 121, June 24, 1861.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 128, September 4, 1861; No. 129, September 27, 1861.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 136, December 18, 1861.

⁷⁰ Paul, Richmond, V, No. 282, December 8, 1861.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, VI, No. 402, December 10, 1864; Lanen, Charleston, VII, No. 19, December 23, 1864.

⁷² St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 39, March 15, 1863; Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 136, December 18, 1861.

in circulation, Charleston merchants refused for a time to sell their goods at any price, and closed their shops. A tax laid on notes of larger denominations led to hoarding of the smaller ones. As a result nothing could be purchased for less than \$10.⁷³ It is not surprising that even in 1863, according to the Richmond reports, "the people of the South are beginning to get used to the idea of bankruptcy"; that in 1864, "the South . . . fights now with no fear of losing anything materially or at least in a pecuniary way, for the state of its finances could not be more deplorable"; that Paul could speak of "what I will no longer call the depreciation but the dissolution of paper money."⁷⁴

No doubt the financial condition of the Confederacy had some influence on French policy toward the South; but just how much is difficult to say. From a voluminous report submitted by Paul in September, 1862, long extracts were taken for a "confidential communication" to Napoleon's minister of finance. The report was a gloomy one; it showed that the Confederacy rested on the shaky foundations of loans and inflation, while the public debt was reaching a "colossal figure." Even should the South triumph, said the Consul, it would face the future in a state of complete economic collapse. What lesson did he draw for France? Mainly this: that if the Confederacy should win its independence, European businessmen must regard it as a poor risk, to be dealt with only if "extreme circumspection" were used.⁷⁵ So questionable a future as this was hardly calculated to win French support for the South.

Only three months later the Confederate government succeeded in floating its largest foreign loan, with the firm of Erlanger in Paris. Paul wrote at once that the terms were very favorable to the lenders, but that the advantages of the loan would not be fully realized unless the Confederacy were recognized.⁷⁶ This report, marked "very urgent," was sent

⁷³ Lanen, Charleston, VII, No. 13, March 5, 1864.

⁷⁴ Paul, Richmond, V, No. 358, November 23, 1863; VI, No. 384, July 8, 1864; No. 385, August 1, 1864.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, V, No. 315, September 25, 1862.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 328, February 8, 1863.

to the minister of finance in Paris; but apparently it had no influence on Napoleon's policy toward the South.

In the closing months of the war South Carolina made one last effort to bring in French capital by authorizing a "Franco-Carolinian Bank." Consul Lanen warned the French government strongly against allowing investment in this risky institution, for, in his opinion, the cause of the South was lost.⁷⁷

Federal control in New Orleans failed to solve the problems of "the Queen of the South," according to the consular reports. Just before the city fell, most of its remaining capital was shipped out to neighboring states. Uncertainty as to General Butler's future financial policy led to "the singular spectacle of a community formerly rich, yet more than half of whose members are on the eve of dying of hunger, not because of lack of food, but rather by absolute lack of means for acquiring it."⁷⁸ Butler soon eliminated one factor in the chaotic situation by setting a date for the withdrawal of Confederate paper. In the meantime, there occurred a flurry of speculation in these notes, which Méjan blamed on the collusion of the Federal authorities. "The spirit of speculation follows the northern armies everywhere," the Consul declared, "and the great interests which they are charged with defending never cause their private interests to be lost entirely from view."⁷⁹

From 1862 until the end of the war Méjan and Fauconnet pictured New Orleans as a city of ruin and desolation. Commerce did not revive to an appreciable extent; the planters were wiped out, and the banks, "swollen with notes subscribed by the planters," were expected to follow.⁸⁰ Yet in January, 1863, Méjan reported that most New Orleans bank notes were accepted at par, while northern greenbacks had depreciated 7 or 8 per cent. Increasing the monetary chaos was the flood of counterfeit bank notes and greenbacks which had arrived from the North. General Butler's brother, "who for some time was the master of all legitimate and illegitimate transactions," was accused of having

⁷⁷ Lanen, Charleston, VII, No. 21, January 5, 1865.

⁷⁸ Méjan, New Orleans, XIII, No. 146, May 21, 1862.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, XIV, No. 167, December 14, 1862.

spread the false bills. "It is certain that a single man coming from the North brought a quantity worth 600,000 piastres," Consul Méjan added.⁸¹ In January, 1864, local bank notes and greenbacks were still at a common level; but shortly thereafter General Banks provisionally suspended the operations of New Orleans banks. During 1864 their notes suffered progressive depreciation and disappeared by the end of the year.⁸²

The French consuls were human enough to spend considerable time complaining of the hardships they were forced to endure. They were especially annoyed by the shortage of certain articles and by prices that mounted to dizzy heights. St. André at Charleston insisted that life there was twice as expensive as at Richmond or New Orleans, owing to the refusal of Charleston authorities to fix prices.⁸³ But if any city is to be granted the dubious honor of "most expensive," it would seem to be Richmond.⁸⁴ Consul Paul was especially disheartened by the vegetable shortage. Except for potatoes there were "no other vegetables except cabbages and one cabbage, *one single cabbage*, costs \$1.25¢. (I say: *one cabbage one dollar twenty-five cents.*)"⁸⁵

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, No. 169, January 14, 1863.

⁸² Fauconnet, New Orleans, XIV, No. 206, January 30, 1864; No. 213, April 22, 1864; XV, No. 231, March 4, 1865. But Fauconnet declared in March, 1865, that some people were hoarding New Orleans bank notes "as offering more guarantees for the future than United States paper itself."

⁸³ St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 20, April 6, 1862.

⁸⁴ This was partly a consequence of overcrowding. "The presence of the government and the Congress has drawn an excessive population to Richmond which makes it a city of almost one hundred thousand inhabitants while it contained only 45 thousand before the war. Thus the city has become a hell for all those who are forced to live there." Paul, Richmond, V, No. 333, March 15, 1863. The following examples taken from lists submitted by the consuls allow some comparison:

	Richmond (July 2, 1862)	Charleston (April 6, 1862)	New Orleans (Nov 12, 1861)
Beef, lb.60	.37½	
Salt pork, lb.80	.85	.22½
Flour, bbl.	15.00		12.00
Raw sugar, lb.75	.20	
Butter, lb.	1.25	.75	.40
Eggs, doz.	1.25	.40	
Tea, lb.	8.00	8.00	
Coffee, lb.	2.50	1.00	1.00

⁸⁵ Paul, Richmond, V, No. 310, July 2, 1862.

This was only a beginning. Price increases continued everywhere, even in occupied New Orleans. Transportation difficulties, the blockade, speculation, reduced production, and depreciated currency were all blamed. By 1863 Richmond prices averaged ten times higher than peacetime levels. "Famine is feared for this summer," wrote Paul. "It is at Richmond's gates. The stock is sufficient, it is said, in the interior of the country. That is possible; but there is no proof, and if the fact is exact, one can proclaim that everything is organized in the most deplorable manner." In Virginia "extortioners" were getting hold of everything which the government passed over; at Charleston, Wilmington, and Mobile they raised the price of smuggled goods to levels which no one could pay. Even a native product like rice had been forced up 400 per cent at Charleston.⁸⁶

The climax came early in April, 1863, when a three-day "bread riot" broke out in Richmond. Paul's interpretation of this affair was unorthodox. He reported that not a single bakery was attacked, but only stores selling arms and manufactured goods. "Evidently the agitators of this disorder had no need of bread," Paul inferred, "but the shortage of foodstuffs is tending to become so serious that it naturally served as pretext for a movement doubtless organized by the secret agents of the North." The Consul declared that the pillagers disdained the food distributed to them by the Richmond authorities.⁸⁷

The Confederate government attempted to solve its problems in March, 1863, by the impressment law. Commodities needed for the army were to be purchased by the government at a "just compensation." This pleased no one. The farmer was forced to sell below the market price, while the civilian got no benefit from the price reduction.⁸⁸ The law was particularly unpopular in South Carolina, where it was put in force toward the end of the year. Besides fixing a "just compensation" at about one fourth of the market price, it gave rise to many abuses. Lanen at Charleston reported that impressing agents often stopped

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 333, March 15, 1863; Lanen, Charleston, VII, No. 3, June 22, 1863; St. André, Charleston, VII, No. 35, January 29, 1863.

⁸⁷ Paul, Richmond, V, No. 336, April 12, 1863.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

wagons on the road and seized provisions or horses for the government. There were also adventurers who impersonated impressing agents and seized commodities for resale at a higher price. The result was that farmers recouped their losses by raising the prices of nonimpressed goods. "Thus it becomes daily more difficult for everyone not belonging to the army, not to live well, but to live," wrote Lanen. "Without the extensive charity distributed by the municipality of Charleston, many families would die of hunger; and the only two hotels which remained open in this city have found it necessary to close."⁸⁹

It would be profitless to trace the continued upward price curve. By the end of the war flour had reached \$380 a barrel at Charleston, \$1,000 at Richmond.⁹⁰ At New Orleans, too, Fauconnet reported "extraordinary prices, out of proportion to the depreciation of paper money."⁹¹ Yet in spite of privation neither Charleston nor Richmond was evacuated because of the food shortage; only military necessity finally forced that move.⁹²

Months before Appomattox the consuls had observed the growth of lassitude and discontent that foretold disaster. Southerners, in the opinion of Consul Paul, had come to understand that slavery was incompatible with modern civilization.⁹³ As for southern nationalism, he was now convinced that it had never existed. "The illusions of former times have disappeared," he asserted. "The war is becoming impossible. Men are lacking. Bread, like men, is lacking." As for the future, Paul prophesied that the utter exhaustion of the South would make for an easy and rapid solution of the problems of peace and reconstruction.⁹⁴

But Paul and his colleagues were better observers than prophets. Looking back over their dispatches one may conclude that they furnished a relatively well-informed and objective description of conditions in the Confederacy. Their correspondence suggests: (1) that the block-

⁸⁹ Lanen, Charleston, VII, No. 9, December 3, 1863.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 19, December 23, 1864; Paul, Richmond, VI, No. 404, January 28, 1865.

⁹¹ Fauconnet, New Orleans, XIV, No. 210, August 1, 1864.

⁹² Paul, Richmond, VI, No. 410, April 11, 1865.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, No. 396, October 31, 1864.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, No. 404, January 28, 1865.

ade, though leaky, weighed heavily on the South; (2) that staple crops approached the vanishing point toward the end of the war, while their replacement by cereals was never fully successful; (3) that Confederate statesmen were partly responsible for a state of financial chaos, which in turn made the South a questionable field for French investment; and (4) that high prices and food scarcity contributed greatly to the decline of southern morale.

Notes and Documents

RUTLEDGE, "THE DICTATOR"

BY ROBERT W. BARNWELL, JR.

Prominent among the traditions of the American Revolution in South Carolina is the story of the one-man rule exercised by John Rutledge. In substance this tradition is that the General Assembly, when confronted with invasion, conferred almost unlimited powers on the Governor, who was thereby enabled to carry on the government after the state was overrun and virtually every other official captured. The best-known source for the conferring of the extraordinary powers is the following passage by Dr. David Ramsay: "The assembly, then sitting, immediately broke up, and delegated, 'till ten days after their next session, to the governor John Rutledge, esquire, and such of his council as he could conveniently consult, a power to do everything necessary for the public good, except the taking away the life of a citizen without legal trial.' "¹

For years this statement was accepted without question, and Ramsay as a member of Governor Rutledge's Executive Council might be assumed to have had a personal knowledge of the matter. Edward McCrady, writing a century later, accepted Ramsay's account, though he was unable to find the act conferring the powers.² The author of the most recent history of South Carolina, Professor David D. Wallace, has discovered the supposedly lost act, which is dated February 3, 1780, and bears the slightly deceptive title of "An Ordinance for the Better Defence and Security of this State, during the Recess of the General As-

¹ David Ramsay, *The History of the Revolution of South-Carolina, from a British Province to an Independent State*, 2 vols. (Trenton, 1785), II, 47-48.

² Edward McCrady, *The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780* (New York, 1902), 432.

sembly."³ Professor Wallace, however, considers the powers granted as "astonishingly limited."⁴

This modification of a traditional idea respecting the most prominent South Carolinian of his time has led to the following study of the powers granted to and actually exercised by Rutledge during the period of his alleged dictatorship. The ordinance of February 3, 1780, conferred on the governor and Council a number of specific powers, namely, to embody the militia and provide for the support of the families of poor militiamen during service; to stop vendues, commercial transactions, and the proceedings of the Court of Common Pleas; to erect and repair forts; to build, hire, and purchase vessels, and allow bounties for the enlistment of seamen; to lay up magazines of arms and provisions; and to enter buildings and break locks in the search of articles needed for the public. Furthermore, the faith and credit of the state were pledged for any expense the governor and Council might incur in carrying out the above powers. But hidden away in the midst of these specific powers were the words: "and to do all other matters and things which may be judged expedient and necessary to secure the liberty, safety and happiness of this State, except taking away the life of a citizen without legal trial. Provided, it does not extend to subject the militia to articles of war for the regulation of the Continental or State troops."⁵

Thus, in the main, Ramsay's statement is correct, though it is not an exact quotation. On the other hand, the exceptions lessened to a considerable degree both the general and specific powers granted. In the first place, the length of militia service was not to be increased and only a third of the militia could be called out at a time except within eighty miles of the portion of the state invaded. The significance of this was that only a third of the militia from the back-country districts of Ninety Six and Camden (which were by far the most thickly populated parts of the state) could be marched to the defense of the coast. Also power

³ Thomas Cooper and David J. McCord (eds.), *The Statutes at Large of South Carolina*, 9 vols. and index (Columbia, 1836-1873), IV, 504-506.

⁴ David D. Wallace, *A History of South Carolina*, 4 vols. (New York, 1934), II, 197-98.

⁵ Cooper and McCord (eds.), *Statutes at Large*, IV, 504-506. See, in particular, Art. III.

to stop court proceedings was not to apply in cases of persons who refused to give security for just debts or of persons about to leave the state, and supplies seized for public use were to be paid for at current prices. Most important of all was the sentence that explicitly denied the power to place the militia under Continental regulations. Thus, in creating a "dictator," the legislature took care that he did not have the one power which would have been most useful and which was the one most feared by the people of South Carolina.⁶ They saw to it that there would be no draft such as was carried out by the government of the Confederacy in 1862 and by the United States during the World War.

There may be a lost story connected with the clause expressly forbidding the governor to take the life of a citizen without legal trial. The ordinance of February 3, 1780, was not the first of its kind in South Carolina, for an almost identical ordinance of February 19, 1779, granted the governor and Council the extraordinary power "to do all other matters and things which may be judged expedient," but the words "except taking away the life of a citizen without legal trial" do not occur.⁷ Are we, therefore, to infer that during the interval between these two ordinances, Rutledge ordered the execution of persons without trial? If he did, the details have not been recorded. At least seven Loyalists were

⁶ The militia was subject only to the state militia laws which did not provide the death penalty for mutiny and desertion. There was an attempt in 1779 to place the militia under the same articles of war that were in force in the Continental army, but without success. Colonel Charles Pinckney championed the rights of the citizens in this instance. McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*, pp. 333-35; Wallace, *History of South Carolina, II, 186*; William Moultrie, *Memoirs of the American Revolution so far as it Related to the States of North and South Carolina, and Georgia*, 2 vols. (New York, 1802), I, 271-77, 314.

⁷ There was also an important difference in the wording of the exception relating to the militia. The ordinance of 1779 read: "Provided, it does not extend to subject the militia to articles of war for the regulation of Continental or State troops; unless the militia law or laws now in force shall first be found insufficient by the Governor and Privy Council." Cooper and McCord (eds.), *Statutes at Large, IV*, 470-72. The ordinance of 1779 is also mentioned by Ramsay, *History of the Revolution of South-Carolina, II*, 19. McCrady did not think the ordinance of 1779 conferred as much power as that of 1780, but an examination of the two shows the reverse to be true. McCrady also points out that in 1775 the Assembly on adjourning authorized William H. Drayton, Charles Pinckney, and Thomas Heyward, Jr., to order whatever they thought necessary for the public safety until the meeting of the Provincial Congress on the following day. McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*, pp. 319-20.

executed in 1779, but they were regularly condemned in the state courts. Some light is shed on this point by a Loyalist's pamphlet in which Rutledge's conduct in 1779 is excoriated as follows:

His mind perpetually agitated by arrogance, irresolution and cruelty, led him to other acts of the highest criminality in a free country; he dared to strike a citizen, and ordered to immediate execution three unhappy men, who on their knees in vain implored one hour's respite to address the throne of mercy. The affront to the citizen gave rise to a popular ebullition, which he was glad to allay by an apology as public as the insult had been. Taking the lives of his fellow creatures without a trial or hearing, as their complexions were a few shades darker than his own, was deemed a matter of less consequence by this zealous Assertor of the Rights of Mankind. Such arbitrary stretches of power under legal government, should have been expiated by the death of the upstart Despot; in the present state of matters, they only reminded every man how requisite it was to court his favor.⁸

Although this article must be discounted as highly prejudiced, the charge of striking a citizen is true,⁹ and there must have been some basis for the charge of executing persons without trial. The readiest inference is that it was in connection with some military matter. Apparently, the victims were not citizens but persons of color or slaves. Although no positive conclusion can be made on account of the insufficiency of the evidence, the above circumstances give reason to suspect that there was a connection between the execution of these men and the change in the powers granted the governor and Council by the Assembly at its next session.

That the people of South Carolina felt that the executive branch had

⁸ "Agricola" [John Wells], *To the Legislature of South Carolina* (London, 1783), a printed letter in the Chalmers Collection (New York Public Library), Carolina, II, 127. Wells, who in 1783 was a refugee in England, had been a prominent Loyalist and editor of the Charleston *South-Carolina and American General Gazette*, 1775-1780, and of the Charleston *Royal Gazette*, 1781-1782. For the establishment of his identity as "Agricola," see John Wells to George Chalmers, n.d., Chalmers Collection, Carolina, II, 149. On the back of the letter to the South Carolina legislature is written in pencil, "This, says Dr. Garden, contains a true character of John Rutledge." Dr. Garden's son, however, had a very different opinion of Rutledge. See Alexander Garden, *Anecdotes of the Revolutionary War in America* (Charleston, 1822), 173-76.

⁹ In 1779, at the time of Augustine Prevost's expedition against Charleston, Rutledge struck with his riding whip a gentleman who was serving in the militia. He returned next day and apologized. Joseph Johnson, *Traditions and Reminiscences chiefly of the American Revolution in the South* (Charleston, 1851), 224.

been vested with very great powers is quite evident. The legislature took pains to justify such a grant of powers by the age-old plea of necessity in an emergency, for the preamble of the ordinance of 1780 is as follows:

WHEREAS, in times of danger and invasion, it has always been the policy of republics to concentrate the powers of government in the hands of the supreme magistracy, for a limited time, to give vigour and despatch to the means of safety; and whereas, from the present situation of affairs within this State, it behoves us for our common safety to follow such example, and, by such well-timed confidence in the servants of the community, acting under the authority of the people and amenable to them, defeat the tyrannical views of an ambitious and cruel enemy, and thereby preserve our peace, liberty and happiness, and prevent the injuries of slavery and oppression; . . .¹⁰

Furthermore, the critics of the Revolutionary party noted the extent of power granted and pointed out its inconsistency with the claim that the war was being fought for liberty. A Loyalist jibe at the government of South Carolina is as follows: "In Carolina they established two supreme powers independent of each other in the same system and when they found this would not do, vested more power in the breast of one man, than is possessed by the most despotic power in Europe."¹¹

One-man rule had not been intended by the legislature, for the governor was required to act with the advice and consent of the Executive Council. There was a provision, however, that in case a quorum could not be obtained as expeditiously as the emergency might require, the governor might proceed with the advice of such members as could be convened. This provision was of considerable importance. Just before the siege of Charleston by the British, it was decided to divide the government of the state. The Lieutenant Governor and four members of the Council remained within the town, while Governor Rutledge and three members of the Council went into the country to raise a force of militia and to maintain the state government there. Thus when Charleston fell the latter group escaped capture and made its way to North Carolina. But during the dark period when there seemed to be no hope

¹⁰ Cooper and McCord (eds.), *Statutes at Large*, IV, 504.

¹¹ *Charleston South-Carolina and American General Gazette*, December 30, 1780.

for the recovery of South Carolina, and when there was a widespread rumor that Congress intended to abandon that state and Georgia, two members of the Council, Colonel Charles Pinckney and Daniel Huger, returned and surrendered to the British.¹² It is possible that Rutledge himself took some steps toward a reconciliation with the British,¹³ but the assurance of aid from the other states and partisan uprisings in the South Carolina back country caused him to continue the struggle. As is well known, the battle of Camden shattered the hopes of quick relief and for over a year Rutledge had to remain an exile from South Carolina, though he was its government. It is true that there remained one member of the Council, John L. Gervais, with whom Rutledge was supposed to consult, but as the former soon went to Virginia,¹⁴ the Governor for a time at least exercised a one-man rule.

The powers of "the dictator" while in exile were very limited and amounted to little more than the appointment of militia officers. However, as the partisan leaders depended not merely on volunteers, but sought to enforce the militia laws, the fact that they held commissions was of importance. Also, the merest shadow of government was of value from the standpoint of prestige, especially as the British sought to win over those reluctant to take protection with the argument that the state no longer existed.

In the summer of 1781 the British forces withdrew to the coastal region and Rutledge returned to South Carolina.¹⁵ However, the Gov-

¹² McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*, pp. 464-65, 533, 539-43, 728-29.

¹³ This statement is based on the following passage in a letter from James Simpson to Lord George Germain, dated at Charles Town, August 13, 1780: "Two Months ago I was in great Hopes, that I should by this time have been able to have Wrote yor Lordship, that this Country was entirely reconciled to His Majestys Government, both Laurens, and Rutledge, had taken Measures which indicated their wishes to be received with forgiveness, but some new Scheme is set on foot, General [Horatio] Gates arrived at Deep Creek, in North Carolina the 24th. of July." British Public Records Office, Colonial Office 5/178, f. 113 (transcript in Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress). Simpson was attorney general of South Carolina under the royal government and stood high in the confidence of the British ministers.

¹⁴ McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*, pp. 533-34.

¹⁵ Edward McCrady, *The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1780-1783* (New York, 1902), 511.

ernor lacked a very important requisite of dictatorial power, namely, the control of the military. The regular troops that occupied the state belonged to the Continental army, over which he had no authority. It is true that he had nominal command of the militia, but actually the control depended on the personal influence of the officers, especially the colonels and captains. In two notable instances the militia successfully refused to serve under brigadiers appointed by Rutledge.¹⁶ The "dictator" of South Carolina did not have it in his power to do many things even if he had been inclined. Nevertheless, Rutledge was quite active. He suspended the laws making state and Continental paper money legal tender; he issued a proclamation against plundering and sought to put a stop to the outrages that were being committed by partisans and outlaws; he appointed magistrates and ordinaries, thus restoring a slight degree of civil government; he requisitioned indigo and shipped it to Philadelphia to raise funds for the state; and above all he made strenuous efforts, with varying success, to enforce the militia laws and to organize a body of regular troops.¹⁷

These actions were not the type that one would expect to call forth the cry of "dictator." The question therefore arises, what did Rutledge do to deserve such a reputation? Two of his measures did affect profoundly the status of former citizens of the state and may well be considered the answer to the above question. On September 27, 1781, Rutledge issued a proclamation offering to pardon those who had taken British protection and had not returned to state allegiance, on condition that they surrender within thirty days and perform six months service in the militia. The threat of confiscation and banishment was held out to those who refused the offer. This was a stern measure, though its severities are not immediately apparent. Before the proclamation was issued, as the various portions of the state were recovered many who had taken the royal oath and even some who had held British commissions had been received as citizens of the state merely by complying

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 529-30; *id.*, *South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*, pp. 732, 769-71.

¹⁷ *Id.*, *South Carolina in the Revolution, 1780-1783*, pp. 511-21; Wallace, *History of South Carolina*, II, 296-98.

with the militia laws or in some instances by hiring a substitute in the state troops. But Rutledge's proclamation was based on the theory that taking protection, even though there was no American army or government within the state at the time, was treason; and, therefore, in order to obtain pardon persons had to perform a greater term of militia duty than could have been required of citizens. Hiring substitutes was ruled out, at least temporarily. Also, the proclamation was addressed principally to persons within or close to the British lines. If these obeyed the proclamation, their slaves and movable property would be taken by the British; if they did not obey it, they ran the risk of confiscation by the Americans. But the harshest feature was that certain classes of persons, notably those that had held British commissions or had signed congratulatory addresses, were excepted from the benefits of the proclamation.¹⁸ Many of these would gladly have returned to state allegiance if they had been permitted to do so. Rutledge's proclamation must be considered the source of the confiscation and amercement acts of 1782.¹⁹

In defense of this proclamation it may be said that the people had submitted to the British from fear of losing their property, and Rutledge employed this same weapon to force them again to support the American cause. It was considered good strategy and is said to have caused several hundred persons to leave the British lines and join the American forces.²⁰

The second important use of the extraordinary powers was the fixing of the qualifications of voters. Rutledge decided that the time was favorable for calling a meeting of the Assembly. In the writs of election, issued in December, 1781, he explicitly instructed the managers not to receive the vote of any person who, having taken British protection, had not returned to state allegiance on or before September 27, 1781.²¹

¹⁸ This proclamation is printed in Robert W. Gibbes, *Documentary History of the American Revolution, consisting of letters and papers relating to the contest chiefly in South Carolina, 1781-1782* (Columbia, 1853), 175-78.

¹⁹ "Cassius" [Aedanus Burke], *An Address to the Freemen of the State of South Carolina* (Charleston, 1783), 3.

²⁰ Ramsay, *History of the Revolution of South-Carolina*, II, 332.

²¹ McCrady searched in vain for a proclamation containing these directions, and incidentally he misstated the qualifications for voting. See McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution, 1780-1783*, pp. 555-56. The directions are printed on the election writs. Some

Thus, even those who had obeyed the proclamation of that date were excluded from voting on the ground that pardon was conditional on the completion of six months militia service. It has been charged that Rutledge issued verbal directions to the managers to see that certain members were chosen and that these directions were followed.²² Definite proof is lacking, but this could easily have been done, for in some cases the electorate was ridiculously small. The parishes of St. Philip and St. Michael, St. Andrew, St. James Goose Creek, and perhaps others were within or so close to the British lines that the election was held elsewhere. Apparently only thirty votes were cast for the two Charleston parishes and only four for St. Andrew's, yet the former elected two senators and thirty representatives and the latter one senator and six representatives.²³ John Rutledge himself was chosen as a member of the lower house from St. Andrew's.

The Assembly met early in 1782 and passed legislation in line with the policy laid out by Rutledge, the most famous measure being the confiscation act. Rutledge afterwards was bitterly criticized for these harsh and in many instances unjust measures, but the onus cannot be placed on "the dictator" alone, as they were passed with little opposition by the legislature. Furthermore, it must be remembered that they were not acts of revenge, but were financial measures and apparently the only means of raising funds necessary for carrying on the war.²⁴ By calling a meeting of the Assembly "the dictator" relinquished the reins of government, for his extraordinary powers automatically expired ten days after the Assembly convened, and an immediate re-election was not allowed by the state constitution. However, the ordinance conferring extraordinary powers on the governor and Council was re-enacted and of these writs, which also contain the returns, are in the custody of the South Carolina Historical Commission, Columbia.

²² [Burke], *Address to the Freemen of the State of South-Carolina*, 18-19.

²³ Writs and returns for the election of 1781, in South Carolina Historical Commission. The returns for St. Philip's and St. Michael's contain the ballots and a tabulation showing that only thirty votes were cast. The returns for St. Andrew's contain only four ballots and no tabulation. These returns are only for the senators. Whether more votes were cast for the members of the lower house is not known.

²⁴ Garden, *Anecdotes of the Revolutionary War*, 176; Ramsay, *History of the Revolution of South-Carolina*, II, 351-55.

remained in effect until the announcement of the signing of the treaty of peace.²⁵ Thus, except for the fact that there were full executive councils to consult, Governors John Matthews and Benjamin Guerard were vested with as much power as Rutledge.

Rutledge's conduct during the war gave him great prestige and won for him the confidence of many, yet at the same time he was subjected to bitter criticisms. The most famous attack on Rutledge was a pamphlet which was written by Judge Aedanus Burke under the pseudonym "Cassius." It declared the proclamation of September 27, 1781, contrary to international law and the election of 1781 inconsistent with the state constitution. Burke argued that a law empowering the governor to do whatever was necessary for the safety of the state did not give him the right to overthrow the constitution. Furthermore, he said that Rutledge's motive had been to place the government in the hands of a few families by disfranchising the lower and middle classes,²⁶ but this charge requires additional research before a conclusion can be reached. There was a rumor at the time that General Thomas Sumter was to be a candidate for governor in opposition to the "aristocratick party,"²⁷ and it is apparent that the upper class in South Carolina stood very much in fear of what might happen if the masses gained control of the state. On the other hand, Rutledge's measures were directed against those who aided the British and it was the so-called aristocratic faction that secured a revision of the confiscation act after the war.

It must be admitted that the powers wielded by South Carolina's "dictator" seem slight when compared with those of famous dictators of other days. Nevertheless, it is true that John Rutledge was vested with broad powers, that he was virtually the government of South Carolina during the most critical months of the British occupation, and that at times he exercised his powers with severity, albeit with discretion and sound judgment. It can also be maintained that the exercise of these powers by Rutledge was a factor in the recovery of the state. Thus, in the main, the traditional view of Rutledge "the dictator" is sustained.

²⁵ Cooper and McCord, (eds.), *Statutes at Large*, IV, 508, 567-68.

²⁶ [Burke], *Address to the Freemen of the State of South-Carolina*, 3-9, 13, 19-21.

²⁷ Anne K. Gregorie, *Thomas Sumter* (Columbia, 1931), 195.

THE JOURNAL OF A PARTY OF EMIGRATING CREEK INDIANS, 1835-1836

EDITED BY GASTON LITTON

At the time of the struggle for American independence the Creek Indians, a branch of the Muskhogean linguistic family, were living in the South—in central Alabama and Georgia.¹ From their geographical and historical association with the white man they had advanced far in learning, in agriculture, and in Anglo-American social and moral observance; indeed, they were a civilized tribe.

In the early part of the nineteenth century there was a strong emigration of white settlers into the Indian domain. The Creek, a people of significant achievements and aware of their rights under prior possession, resisted this white aggression; and bloodshed and reprisals grew out of this conflict between races. As this area of white population expanded there was heard, with greater frequency, the demand that the government extinguish the Indian title to their lands. The Creek dispatched delegations to Washington to secure protection against the operation of the laws of Alabama over them and the intrusion of an alien people on their lands; but the only response they received was the government's disgraceful acknowledgment of impotency.

Indian removal had progressed for some years in a haphazard manner, but it became established as a national policy with the election to the presidency of its most ardent exponent, Andrew Jackson.² By the passage of the general Indian Removal bill in 1830³ conditions were allowed to come into existence which impelled the Creek to find a re-

¹ A definitive history of the preremoval Creek has not yet been written. There are a few articles covering various phases of the Creek story, among which should be mentioned the contributions of John R. Swanton. See especially his study on *The Early History of the Creek Indians and Their Neighbors*, in Bureau of American Ethnology, *Bulletin 73* (Washington, 1922). See also, James Mooney, "Creeks," in Frederick W. Hodge (ed.), *Handbook of American Indians*, in Bureau of American Ethnology, *Bulletin 30* (Washington, 1907), Pt. I, 362-65.

² This election and its more immediate consequences to the southern Indians are discussed in Annie H. Abel, "The History of Events Resulting in Indian Consolidation West of the Mississippi," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1906, I (Washington, 1908), 370-412.

³ 4 *United States Statutes at Large*, 411-12.

fuge in the wilderness west of the Mississippi River.⁴ Two years later they entered into a treaty by which they ceded to the Federal government all their lands east of the Mississippi.⁵ The United States, anxious to settle the Indians upon less desirable and more remote lands farther west, was to pay the expense of their removal and to subsist them for one year after their arrival in the West. In the summer of 1834 extensive preparations were made for the removal by Commissary General of Removal and Subsistence George Gibson. Colonel John B. Hogan was appointed Superintendent of the Creek Removal; he was succeeded by Major Uriah Blue and, later, by Captain John Page. Captain Page, during the early part of the emigration, was the disbursing agent for the Federal government in the Creek country; and Captain J. R. Stephenson filled the same position in the Creek Nation West. The contract to supply the transportation and subsistence of the Indians during the emigration was let to J. W. A. Sanford and Company.⁶

Lieutenant Edward Deas was appointed "Disbursing Agent in the Emigration of the Creek Indians." Deas, born in South Carolina about 1812, had been a cadet at the United States Military Academy from July 1, 1828, to July 1, 1832. Upon his graduation he became a second lieutenant in the Fourth Artillery. That year he served briefly on the Black Hawk expedition, though he was not at the seat of the war. Later, he was stationed at Fort Gratiot, Michigan, and in September, 1835,

⁴ Many such regrettable occurrences preceding and incident to the Creek emigration are recounted in Grant Foreman, *Indian Removal* (Norman 1932), 107-90. The author, in tracing the broad story of the southern Indian emigration, has made abundant citations to and abstracts of the official government archives, newspaper sources, and private manuscript collections dealing with this tragic enterprise.

⁵ Charles J. Kappler (ed.), *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* (Washington, 1903-), II, 247-49.

⁶ This contract, under the date of September 17, 1835, provided that the Creek and their slaves were to be removed and subsisted, from Alabama to a point within twenty miles of Fort Gibson, at the border of the new Creek lands in the West. For each person emigrated the firm was to receive \$20; for all persons who died or were necessarily left on the way, because of sickness or other inability to proceed, an amount in proportion to the distance traveled was to be allowed. See Office of Indian Affairs, Removal and Subsistence of Indians, Contracts, B, 233-36, Art. VIII. These and other Indian Office records are now in the custody of the Archivist of the United States, The National Archives, Washington. Hereafter this collection will be referred to by the abbreviation OIA.

was transferred to Fort Mitchell, Alabama, to become disbursing agent in charge of the Creek removal.⁷

Arriving at Fort Mitchell, Lieutenant Deas was instructed by General Gibson:

To see that the Indians of the party are correctly enrolled and regularly subsisted; that the transportation is of a proper kind and kept in good order; to examine, daily, the condition of the party and to note in a journal the occurrence of each day; to protect the Indian in their rights, any invasion of which to be remonstrated against, and to report to this office and to the Superintendent a want of attention to your remonstrance, and, when the contracts are not concerned, the cause and result of any difficulty into which any emigrants may get; to consult with the surgeon in regard to the health of the Indians, the quality of provisions &c. as provided in Article XI of the contract; to make arrangements for the support of such Indians as may be left on the way. It will be your duty, also, agreeably to the contract, to supply provisions or transportation on the route in cases where the contractors may fail to do so.⁸

Under these instructions Deas entered upon his duties. In a subsequent letter to General Gibson, Deas stated that on November 13 he left Fort Mitchell and proceeded to Montgomery to obtain funds that might be necessary on the route.⁹ On the twenty-third he reached one of the points of assembly near Young's Ferry, where about five hundred Indians from different points in the Nation had gathered. On the next day the party, under the direction of the agent of the contractors, marched to a place near Wetumpka, Alabama.¹⁰ At that encampment

⁷ Lieutenant Deas remained in the work of Indian removal until 1839. During that time he also participated in the emigration of the Cherokee. So grateful were the members of one Cherokee party for Deas' attention to their health and comfort that they presented him a sword upon their arrival in the West. After the work of Indian removal had closed, Deas served at a number of army posts. In 1845 he participated in the military occupation of Texas, and from 1846 to 1848 he served in the War with Mexico. During that conflict he was promoted to the rank of captain in the Fourth Artillery. His life, most exemplary as seen in the records of the Office of Indian Affairs, came to an untimely end on May 16, 1849, when he was drowned while crossing the Rio Grande. He was thirty-seven. See George W. Cullum (ed.), *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U. S. Military Academy*, 2 vols. (New York, 1868), I, 404; *Army and Navy Chronicle* (Washington, 1835-1842), VIII (1839), 316.

⁸ Gibson to Deas, September 30, 1835, in OIA, Removal and Subsistence of Indians, Letters Written, C, 265-67.

⁹ Deas to George Gibson, December 6, 1835, in OIA, Creek Emigration, D-52/1835.

¹⁰ On December 8, 1835, Uriah Blue, assistant agent and acting superintendent of Creek Removal, made the following report to General Gibson: "I calculated on enrolling the

the enrollment of the party was made; it was found that 511 Creek were ready to begin the trek westward.¹¹

The journey of these home-loving, pastoral people to their new location was, for the most part, a tragic undertaking fraught with hardships, suffering, and incredible misery. Lack of experience, inadequate preparation, and the appointment of political incompetents to posts of importance resulted in cruel and unnecessary suffering by the emigrants. A few of the removal parties reached the new lands after a comparatively easy journey. In some instances the fidelity and skill of the regular army officers supervising the removal were met with equal co-operation on the part of the contractors; but favorable weather and good health were the factors most necessary for the success of these trips. This combination of favorable forces prevailed in the instance of the first of these parties, the story of which is told just as it was lived day by day, in this

JOURNAL OF OCCURRENCES ON THE ROUTE OF A PARTY OF EMIGRATING CREEK
INDIANS, KEPT BY LIEUT. EDW. DEAS, DISBURSING AGENT IN
THE CREEK EMIGRATION¹²

emigrating party of Indians in Tallapoosa County, where all the parties were to join but I found it impossible to get a correct roll while in the Nation in the vicinity of so many grog shops & as they expected more to join near Wetumpka, I determined to accompany them out of the Nation and get them out of the way of those grog shops, then halt & enroll them, which I did after crossing the Coosa at Wetumpka and going about four miles in Autaugua County. I stood by and counted the number in each family as they was brought up and enrolled the whole party amounting to 511. The Party is conducted by Doct^r. [S. M.] Ingersol on the part of the contractors and Lieut. Deas as the agent of the government. They appear to be well supplied with Transportation and everything goes on well. Doctor Ingersol shows every disposition to fulfill the contract. Doctor [B.] Randal shew^d me a letter from your department referring him to Colⁿ [John B.] Hogan as to the propriety of his being permitted not to accompany the present emigrating party. The contract requires that the Government should furnish a Doct^r to each party, and if any difference should arise between the Contractor and the Government Agent as to the provisions, the Doct^r is made the arbitrator. I therefore thought it proper he should continue." General Gibson's original instructions prevailed; Doctor Randall accompanied the party to the West. OIA, Creek Emigration, B-423/1835.

¹¹ At least three rolls are known to have been made of this party. The list referred to here is the Sanford or contractors' roll, which became the basis of the company's claim for compensation. It is Number 6 and is enclosed in a letter of J. W. A. Sanford to General Gibson, December 3, 1835, in OIA, Creek Emigration, S-177/1835. This list is not to be confused with the J. R. Stephenson roll, prepared upon the arrival of the party in the West, or with the roll kept by Lieutenant Deas.

¹² This Journal, which is Number 61-J of the Creek Emigration Papers in the Indian

6th December 1835

The first Party of Indians about to Emigrate to Arkansaw under the direction of J. W. A. Sanford and Co. were to-day mustered and enrolled at the encampment 4 miles N. W. from Wetumpka, Alabama, in the presence of Major Blue, the Acting Superintendent of the Removal, and myself and their numbers found to be Five hundred and eleven. In consequence of this, and the Contractors having to make some arrangements for the necessary means of transportation, no progress has been made upon the route to-day.

7th December

The Party started this morning at 8 o'clock & has come to-day about 17 miles upon the road leading in the direction of Montevallo, Alaba^{a.}¹³ The means of Transportation provided is of such quality, & in the quantity required by the Contract.¹⁴ Before starting this morning a drunken quarrel took place among some of the Indians, when one of them (Sikeastic) received a blow upon the head which fractured his scull & caused his death this evening after the Party had encamped. It is thought that the man who struck him had no intention of killing him and will probably be pardoned. Nothing else of importance has

Office Collection now at The National Archives, has been reproduced exactly as it was written, without the addition of punctuation marks, correction of errors and inconsistencies in spelling and capitalization, or the elimination of nondescriptive and repetitious passages. Brevity and terseness characterize the Journal, when description and detail would have contributed historical value; nevertheless, now, more than a century after it was written, it is a revealing picture of the novel and tragic enterprise of Indian removal.

¹³ The routes of the emigrating Creek to their new homes west of the territory of Arkansas were several. By far the greater portion of the Indians were conducted overland to Memphis, by boat down the Mississippi to Montgomery Point, and thence up the Arkansas River to Fort Gibson in the Cherokee country, just a few miles from the new Creek lands. From the places of enrollment, however, the Creek were removed to Memphis over two general routes. A southern road led from the vicinity of Wetumpka, in a northwestwardly direction through Tuscaloosa and, into Mississippi, through Columbus, Athens, Pontotoc, and the Chickasaw country to Memphis. This group of 511 Creek removing under the direction of Lieutenant Deas took the other road, "the Contractors preferring what is called the northern route through Elyton, Moulton, & Tuscumbia, on account of the roads being generally at this season better than which was taken last year through Tuscaloosa, although the latter is somewhat shorter." The northern route from Tuscumbia generally proceeded overland to Memphis; but it will be seen later that the Deas party was obliged to vary that route somewhat. Deas to Gibson, December 21, 1835, in OIA, Creek Emigration, D-55/1835.

¹⁴ Article IV of the contract between the government and the Sanford firm states that "The transportation shall be one six-horse wagon, and fifteen hundred pounds of baggage to from fifty to eighty persons. The provisions and transportation shall be of the best kind. The average daily travel shall not exceed twelve miles." This meant, of course, that most of the Indians walked; certainly those who were not sick or infirm did so. OIA, Removal and Subsistence of Indians, Contracts, B, 233-34.

occurred through the day. The weather has been fine & the roads are now in very good order.

8th December

We have come to-day 15 miles without any occurrence worthy of notice. The Party started about 8 o'clock & stopped for the night a little after 4 P. M. The weather still fine and the roads very good. This being the case we are able to travel rather more than the average of 12 miles a day, but it is understood that when the weather becomes bad & the roads muddy the rate of travelling will be diminished accordingly. Since I have joined the Indians I have carefully attended to the quantity & quality of the Rations and have seen them issued agreeably to the Contract.¹⁵ The provisions so far have consisted of Corn & Fresh Beef.

9th December

We started this morning about 8 o'clock as usual & stopped for the night and encamped between 4 & 5 P. M. after travelling about 16 miles. The weather and roads still good. Nothing of consequence has occurred through the day.

10th December

The Party started this morning between 8 & 9 o'clock and passed through Montevallo in the forenoon. After travelling about 18 miles without any occurrence of importance we stopped & encamped between 4 & 5 o'clock P. M., about 8 miles north of Montevallo.

11th December

It rained last night and the roads to-day have not been so good as heretofore. The Party started between 8 & 9 o'clock this morning and encamped this afternoon between 4 & 5 after travelling about eleven miles. Forde the Cahawba River in the forenoon.

12th December

The Party started at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 o'clock this morning, the weather rainy and the roads muddy. Passed through Elyton in the middle of the day and encamped in the afternoon three miles further on at 4 o'clock after travelling about 13 miles in all. Up to this time the Party has been healthy and nothing of consequence has occurred upon our route besides what has been mentioned.

¹⁵ The Sanford contract further provided in Articles IV and V that "the ration of bread shall be one pound of wheat flour, Indian meal or hard bread, or three-fourths of a quart of corn. The meat ration shall be one pound of fresh, or three-fourths of a pound of salt meat or bacon; and with fresh meat, two quarts of salt to every hundred rations. . . . The provisions shall be issued daily, if practicable, and not less frequently than every other day, as well as while at rest, as during the travel, until the day inclusive of arrival at the point of destination, West; and that there shall be established within three months, points along the route Westward, at which the provisions are to be issued." *Ibid.*, 234.

13th December

No progress has been made to-day in consequence of delay upon the part of some of the Wagoners who remained at Elyton yesterday for repairs, & were expected to come up this morning early. They have been discharged by the Agent and others engaged in their stead.

14th December

The Party started this morning at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 o'clock and has travelled about 16 miles to the south bank of the Black Warrior River and encamped about 4 in the afternoon. The weather still fine and the roads good.

15th December

The Party started to-day at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 o'clock A. M. crossed the Mulberry fork of the Black Warrior & travelled about 15 miles further and crossed another fork of the same stream. The roads are in good order but hilly. Encamped between 4 & 5 o'clock in the afternoon, without any occurrence worthy of notice.

16th December

We started at the usual hour between 8 & 9 o'clock and travelled about 15 miles to Harris' on another Fork of the Black Warrior, crossed it and encamped for the night about 4 o'clock P. M. The roads to-day were hard and good and tolerably level. The Route selected by the Contractors for the Emigration of this Party is somewhat longer than that passing lower down through Tuscaloosa. This has been preferred in consequence of its being generally in better order at this season of the year than the lower route.

17th December

There was a little delay in starting this morning in consequence of engaging another six horse team of Mr. Harris, which required some preparation. The Party started about $\frac{1}{2}$ past 9 o'clock and travelled over level and good roads 17 miles to Day's. Encamped about $\frac{1}{2}$ past 4 P. M. Thus far the progress of the Party has met with no impediment. The weather has been fine, the road good & the people healthy. Provisions of proper quality and quantity have been issued regularly agreeably to the Contract for removing the Indians, under my observation.

18th December

The Party left Day's this morning about 8 o'clock and proceeded 12 miles to the west Fork of Flint Creek and encamped at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The roads were muddy having passed through low swampy ground. Meal was issued to-day for the first time, this being the only opportunity of procuring it since starting. Two days issue was procured at a mill in the neighbourhood of the Camp.

19th December

The Party started from Flint Creek this morning about 8 o'clock & has since come 18 miles and encamped between 4 & 5 o'clock P. M. We passed through Moulton in the middle of the day which is ten miles back. The distance travelled to-day has been rather greater than was intended but after leaving the neighbourhood of Moulton, no water was met with until reaching the present place of Encamping. The roads were fine and level. An Indian woman named Ewoddy and one female Slave joined the Party to-day. Lizzy Connard also left the Party and proceeded with some of her friends who passed on this way to Arkansaw.¹⁶

20th December

The party left the Encampment this morning at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 o'clock. A good deal of rain fell last night and the roads to-day have been muddy. It rained also through the day. The direct road from Moulton to Tuscumbia being impassable at present, we have been obliged to take that through Courtland which place we passed in the middle of the day. After travelling 12 miles encamped for the night. One of Ben Marshall's negro boys is very ill, but not much sickness otherwise up to this time.¹⁷

21st December

Left the Encampment about 8 o'clock this morning & travelled about 14 miles, to within one mile of Tuscumbia & encamped. The roads through the first part of the day were muddy but afterwards were much better. Provisions have still been issued regularly and I hear of no complaints among the People upon any subject.

22nd December

The Party has not left the vicinity of Tuscumbia to-day. The Contractors having heard very unfavorable accounts of the state of the roads from this to Memphis and west of the Mississippi have determined to take water from this place and have made arrangements for suitable Boats for that purpose. The state of the water in the Tennessee and other intermediate rivers is said to be good at present and it is probable we shall get through the journey sooner and more to the comfort of the Indians in this manner than by continueing to travel by land. The Party has been moved to-day to the Steam Boat landing ready to start to-

¹⁶ The name of Ewoddy appears on the Stephenson roll; she is listed as being under twenty-five years of age. The female slave is also noted beside her name. Lizzy Connard's name appears on the contractors' roll but not on the Stephenson list. She is indicated as being under twenty-five years of age and as having six male and five female slaves.

¹⁷ Benjamin Marshall, a half-breed Creek, was a member of the company of J. W. A. Sanford that had the contract for the removal. He was an influential member of his tribe and, indeed, it was largely through his efforts that this party was organized. Marshall had with him his family of eight, and his nineteen slaves.

morrow. Ben Marshall's negro boy who has been sick for some time back died to-day.

23rd December

The People during the fore part of the day were engaged in putting their baggage and small wagons on board the Boats, a Steam Boat and two Keels which are to convey them to Waterloo, thirty miles below at the foot of the shoals where an exchange of boats is to take place. The Indian Ponies & Horses were also collected and a sufficient number of volunteers from the Party to take charge of them set out about noon for Memphis by land, accompanied by two Agents of the Company.¹⁸ In the afternoon the Boats left the wharf with the remainder of the Party and came twenty miles down the Tennessee River where we are now encamped for the night.

24th December

The Party started again this morning at 9 o'clock on board the two Keel Boats and came down to Waterloo by noon, where we expected to find the Steam Boat *Wheeling* which was supposed at Tuscumbia to be at this place. The Party is now encamped just above the town and the Agents are making arrangements to proceed as speedily as possible.

25th December

The Agents of the Company made arrangements with the Steam Boat *Alpha* to convey the Party from Waterloo to Fort Gibson in case the water in the intermediate Rivers will permit. The Party accordingly came on board in the forenoon and about 12 o'clock we proceeded on our way. Two Keel boats of nearly the largest size are also employed and have been put in good order for the comfort and health of the Indians. It is intended to stop at night allowing the People time for Encamping, preparing their food &c. We have come to-day about 30 miles below Waterloo and landed accordingly. The Indians appear well pleased so far with this mode of travelling and appear to be well satisfied in all respects.

26th December

The Boats with the Party on board started this morning at 8 o'clock and have come to-day about 60 miles and encamped for the night between 4 & 5 P. M. The Contractors have been engaged in putting up temporary Cooking Hearths on the decks of the Keel Boats to enable the people to prepare their food through the day, and keep themselves warm when the weather requires it. This

¹⁸ Valuable among the Indians' possessions which they took with them to the West were their horses and ponies. Provisions were made in Article VII of the contract for their care and possible use during the emigration. According to the contractors' roll, prepared before the party set out, there were 170 horses; but Deas stated later in this Journal that the party left Tuscumbia with 154 head.

has not been the case as yet the weather having been remarkably mild. Other necessary fixtures have also been constructed to preserve cleanliness and pure air in the interior of the Boats.¹⁹

27th December

The Party came on board the Boats this morning after day light and we are still running and shall do so through the night in order to reach Paduca at the mouth of the Tennessee River tomorrow morning. I have consulted the surgeon upon the propriety of running through the night, who has no objection and the Indians have also expressed to me their satisfaction with the arrangement, all appearing desirous of getting on as speedily as possible when the health and comfort of none is interfered with. Provisions of Fresh Beef and Corn meal have been issued since leaving Tuscmibia.

28th December

The Boats arrived near Paduca at the mouth of the Tennessee River this morning at 9 o'clock and the greater part of the Indians were landed on an Island in the vicinity of the town. During the day the Contractors have been engaged in procuring provisions, & the Captain of the S. Boat in making preparations to proceed. It being nearly dark before these were compleated, we have decided not to move the Indians from their camps until tomorrow morning. The Steam Boat has been brought over to the Island, the Keels lashed and everything put in readiness to make an early start.

29th December

The Boats with the Party on board started this morning shortly after day light and have come to-day about 75 miles and have stopped for the night about 20 miles below the mouth of the Ohio River. The Contractors purchased to-day a few issues of Salt Pork which will be issued with the Fresh Beef the Indians preferring it so. The Party still continues healthy and the weather up to this time has been mild for the season.

30th December

The Party came on board the Boats this morning at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 o'clock since when we have travelled without interruption. The weather to-day has been remarkably fine and mild so that we have determined to run through the night and expect to reach Memphis in the morning.

31st December

We reached Memphis this morning about 9 o'clock, and landed the Party opposite the town to prevent the Indians if possible from having access to liquor

¹⁹ In a letter to General Gibson written from Paducah on December 28, 1835, Lieutenant Deas stated that "The Boats are cleaned out every night after stopping, & I shall continue to see that all proper precautions are taken to insure the health & comfort of the Emigrants." OIA, Creek Emigration, D-56/1835.

which always creates more difficulty amongst them than any other cause. The Party having charge of the Ponies has also arrived and the operation of bringing them across the Mississippi was finished this afternoon near dark. All the People who accompanied them have arrived without accident, but the case is different with regard to the Horses and Ponies. One hundred & fifty-four of these started from Tuscumbia and only one hundred & thirty-two have crossed the Mississippi. This loss the Agent who accompanied them informed me was owing to a want of sufficient Forage, the allowance of two quarts of corn each not being enough to support them. I found however that the rate of travelling from Tuscumbia to Memphis had more than doubled that laid down in the Contract, and I therefore stated to the Agent of the Company that it was my opinion that when the average rate of travelling was exceeded the amount of Forage should be increased by them in proportion and that unless it was their intention to do so, I objected to the Ponies being obliged to travel more than an average of 12 miles a day. After some discussion my proposition was acceded to and directions were accordingly given that for the future four quarts of corn should be issued instead of two, as it is expected they will probably travel between 20 & 30 miles a day. Nothing else of importance has occurred through the day & everything is in readiness to start as usual in the morning.

1st January 1836

We left our stopping place opposite Memphis this morning at 9 o'clock and have since run without interruption and shall continue to do so through this night. The Party with the Ponies were also assembled opposite the town at the same time, ready to proceed west through the Mississippi Swamp.

2nd January

We reached the mouth of White River this morning about 6 o'clock and stopped a short time to procure Provisions, Wood &c. The Boats then entered the mouth of White River passed through the cut-off into the Arkansas and are now lying by for the night about 40 miles above its mouth. The Boats stopped between 4 & 5 o'clock in the afternoon and the weather being rainy many of the People prefer remaining on board to going on shore and encamping.

3rd January

The Party started this morning shortly after day light and has since come about 40 miles and stopped for the night between 4 & 5 o'clock P. M. Nothing of importance has occurred through the day.

4th January 1836

The Boats were got under way this morning between 6 & 7 o'clock and nothing of consequence has since occurred. We stopped in the afternoon near 5 o'clock having come about 40 miles and some of the People have gone on

shore and made their Camps. The others prefer remaining on board. The weather has been remarkably mild since leaving Memphis and only one day of rain. Provisions have been issued regularly and the Party is still healthy.

5th January

The Party started this morning about 7 o'clock since when we have come something over 40 miles and stopped for the night at 5 o'clock, nothing of consequence has occurred through the day.

6th January

We started this morning between 6 & 7 o'clock as usual and nothing of consequence has since occurred. After coming between 40 & 50 miles the boats were landed at 5 o'clock, for the night. There has been a little rain at intervals through the day, but the weather is at present good and remarkably mild for the season, as it has been since leaving Tuscumbia.

7th January

The Party started as usual this morning between 6 & 7 o'clock and has since come about 40 miles and stopped for the night at 5 o'clock. A Child was born to-day 50 miles below Little Rock but nothing else of any consequence has occurred.

8th January

The Boats got under way this morning about 7 o'clock, and we have come to-day between 30 & 40 miles. We passed through Little Rock in the afternoon without stopping and are now a few miles above that place. The Small Boat was sent on ashore at the town for a few minutes, but it is always a disadvantage to allow the Indians to stop at any place where they can obtain liquor. The most peaceable and apparently well disposed when sober sometimes becomes the most refractory and troublesome when intoxicated. There are some examples of this with the present Party.

9th January

The Boats started as usual this morning after day light, and in the middle of the day it was necessary to stop several hours for the purpose of cutting wood which could not be found at the landings. In consequence we have come only about 22 or 23 miles. The Party was landed for the night between 4 & 5 o'clock this afternoon.²⁰

²⁰ Deas, reporting his progress to General Gibson on January 9, 1836, remarked that "The Arkansas river is not high, but is on the rise and we hope to reach the end of our journey without being again obliged to travel by land. The boats have stopped every night since entering this river, and we have averaged about 40 miles a day. The weather has been remarkably mild & favorable to our progress, and the Indians are all healthy & apparently well satisfied." OIA, Creek Emigration, D-60/1836.

10th January

We got under way this morning about 7 o'clock and have since come between 30 & 40 miles and stopped for the night. In the afternoon a Pilot was taken on board with w[h]ose assistance it was thought we should be able to run in the night without any risk but after doing so a short time after dark one of the Keels struck a snag and sprung a leak in consequence of which it was found necessary to land for the night.

11th January

The Party did not start this morning until 11 o'clock in consequence of delay occasioned by having to leave the Boat which last night sprung a leak. We have since come between 20 & 30 miles and stopped for the night before dark. There was hard rain last night, but the weather is still very mild for the season of the year.

12th January

The Boats were got under way this morning shortly after day light as usual & have since come between 40 & 50 miles without any occurrence of importance and stopped for the night before dark. It is impossible to tell the exact distance travelled upon this river and no two persons agree upon this point. The weather is still mild and very fine and the People continue healthy. Provisions have also been issued regularly up to this time under my observation.

13th January

We started this morning as usual shortly after day light but after running six miles were so unfortunate as to run upon a sandbar which extended across the river. They were unable to get the Boats off until near dark when the Party was landed and encamped for the night. The Party with the Ponies also arrived within a quarter of a mile of this place this afternoon in good condition. This is the first time we have heard of them since leaving Memphis. Nothing worthy of notice has occurred upon their way here and it has only been necessary to leave three of the Ponies upon the road, which were placed in charge of persons who will take care of them until the next Party passes.

14th January

The Boats started this morning about 7 o'clock and we have since come 40 miles without interruption. We stopped a short time in the forenoon to take in Fresh Beef & stores and landed a little before dark for the night.

15th January

The Boats started again this morning as usual about 7 o'clock but after running ten miles struck a Sand-Bar which detained us until near dark when the Boats were separated and thus enabled to reach the shore, and the Party was encamped for the night. The weather still continues fine & mild and the People healthy.

16th January

A new Pilot was taken on Board this morning but we were not able to get fairly started until 11 o'clock on account of the Sand-Bars and have since come about 25 or 30 miles and stopped for the night before dark.

17th January

We have been very unfortunate for the last week in running upon Sand-bars in consequence of the low state of the water. No accident however affecting the Indians has occurred. The Party has only come 5 or 6 miles to-day on account of the Rapids in the neighbourhood though it was found necessary to tow the Boats after separating them, all the People who could walk without injury were landed for this purpose.

18th January

The Party has made no progress to-day in consequence of the difficulty of getting the Boats through the shoals. The Steam-Boat was unlashed from the Keel this morning & passed through the Rapids, but the Keel was not got through until near dark when all the People were carried to the north bank of the river and encamped for the night. There has been no regular issue of corn to-day. I spoke to the Agent upon the subject, who said it was impossible to obtain it to-night there being none in the neighbourhood but that he can obtain a supply in the morning a few miles above. Had the proper means been made use of through the day it might have been obtained before night. I have spoken to the Chief Cotchytustenugga²¹ upon the subject, who thinks there is enough surplus among the Indians to keep them from suffering until tomorrow.

19th January

The Boats started this morning after day light and after running two hours came to a wood landing where corn was obtained for two days and some surplus to make up for the deficiency of yesterday. We have since only come between 20 & 30 miles in consequence of running upon another Sand-Bar this afternoon at 3 o'clock. Every exertion was made to get off until dark without unlashing the keel but failed. This has since been done at 8 o'clock and carried to the north bank of the river and landed with nearly the whole of the Party. The Steam-Boat still remains fast upon the Bar with some of the People on Board.

20th January

We have made no progress to-day, the whole of the time having been em-

²¹ Chief Cotchytustenugga, whose name appears frequently in the Creek emigration records of the Office of Indian Affairs, was one of the chiefs of the Lower Towns. His name, variously spelled, heads the Stephenson roll on which his family is listed as including twelve persons—the new-born boy (see entry for January 28), another male under twenty-five, a woman under twenty-five and one under fifty, the Chief himself who was over fifty years of age, and his slaves, four males and three females.

ployed until dark in getting the S-Boat off the Sand-bar which at last was done. We progress but slowly on our way, but there is no remedy at present and provisions being plentiful and the weather fine, the Indians appear comfortable and satisfied. This River at low water is obstructed by numerous Bars which are constantly changing and without an experienced Pilot the navigation of it is extremely uncertain.

21st January

We have only come 12 miles to-day and are now in the vicinity of the small town of Van Buren. It was necessary to stop several hours in the middle of the day to procure provisions of Corn & Fresh Beef. The Boats started at 9 o'clock A. M. and stopped a short time before dark.

22nd January

The Boats left the neighbourhood of Van Buren this morning about $\frac{1}{2}$ past 7 o'clock and passed Fort Smith about eleven. After proceeding about $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles above the latter place we were stopped by another Sand-Bar which it was found impossible to pass. The People were therefore landed and Encamped about two miles above Fort Smith, on the north Bank of this River. The weather to-day for the first time has been tolerably cold.

23rd January

As it is impossible to go any further up the Arkansas by Steam, the Agent of the Contractors is now making preparations to proceed by land. The Party still remains encamped as yesterday. It was ascertained at Fort Smith that the Party with the Ponies and horses had passed on up towards Fort Gibson about a week ago. A messenger was therefore sent for them to-day to return to this place. There has been some misunderstanding upon this point. The Agent informed me that he had given directions for them to encamp near Fort Smith until the Boats arrived there fearing as has been the case that we should be unable to go the whole distance by water. They are also making arrangements for Wagons in the neighbourhood to proceed as speedily as possible. The weather still continues cold though not very severe.

24th January

Another messenger was dispatched to-day for the return of the Ponies in order to prevent mistakes and as soon as they arrive and the wagons are procured the Party will proceed. Nothing of consequence has occurred through the day, the People continue healthy and Provisions have been issued regularly up to this time. The weather is still cold but dry.

25th January

The Party remains encamped as yesterday. Wagons have been engaged and are expected in tomorrow or the day after. Nothing of consequence has occurred through the day. The weather is still cold.

26th January

Five ox-wagons arrived at the Camp to-day and the others will be in tomorrow. The first messenger that was dispatched to Fort Gibson returned this afternoon, having seen the Agent in charge of the Ponies. They had crossed over into the Creek Nation but will be here by day after tomorrow when we shall be able to proceed on our journey.

27th January

The Party is still encamped near Fort Smith awaiting the return of the Horses from Fort Gibson. The remaining Wagons have arrived at the Camp and every thing is in readiness to proceed as soon as the Ponies and horses get back.

28th January

The Horses & Ponies arrived this afternoon & the Party will proceed in the morning. The weather is fine but cold. A child was born in Cotchytustynugga's family. Nothing of any consequence has occurred through the day.

29th January

The Party started this morning between 9 & 10 o'clock. Ten wagons are engaged as follows—*Three* with six oxen, *Four* with four oxen, *one* with four oxen & one horse, *one* with four horses, and *one* with six mules besides the small wagons belonging to the Indians. One light four-horse wagon was also engaged after the Party had started to convey the family & baggage of a sick woman who was unable to set out on her account with the rest of the Party.²² This wagon overturned in the course of the day, but no serious injury was done. We are now encamped eight miles from Fort Smith. The Party stopped at 5 o'clock.

30th January

The Party started this morning at 8 o'clock, and has come without interruption or any occurrence of consequence to within one mile of Salasaw Creek. The weather is still fine but cold. The Party continues healthy and Provisions have been issued agreeably to the Contract up to this time.

31st January

The Party started this morning at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 o'clock and has come 16 miles & is now encamped at Mackey's 18 miles from Fort Gibson. The weather to-day for the first time has been severely cold, but the roads since leaving Fort Smith have been in very good order. The Party stopped this afternoon at 4 o'clock.

1st February 1836

The Party left Mackey's this morning at $\frac{1}{2}$ past 8 o'clock and crossed the

²² By Article VI of the contract it was provided "that the sick, those enfeebled from age or other cause, and young children shall be transported in wagons, or on horseback."

Illinois R. by fording. They are now encamped $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles east of Fort Gibson, having come $14\frac{1}{2}$ miles to-day, and stopped in the afternoon between 3 & 4 o'clock. A child was born this afternoon at the Encampment. Nothing else of any consequence has occurred. The weather is still very fine and not so cold as yesterday.

2nd February

The Party started this morning at 9 o'clock and reached Fort Gibson between 10 & 11. There being but one Flat at the Garrison Ferry, it was near dark before the whole were crossed over the Grand River. They are now encamped on the east bank of the Verdigris River, one of the boundaries of the Creek Nation, four miles west of Fort Gibson.²³

3rd February

The Party was to-day mustered in the presence of Capt. J. M. Stephenson, the Agent of the Company, and myself, and the greater part of them crossed over the Verdigris River. The Indians have stated that they do not wish to be taken any further than the west bank of the Verdigris, at which point Capt. Stephenson accordingly received them.

4th February 1836

The remainder of the Party was put over the Verdigris River to-day and Captain Stephenson has commenced subsisting them from this date. The Rolls have been signed agreeably to instructions and that of the Contractors and my own were found to agree in all respects.²⁴

In the foregoing Journal every occurrence of any importance has been mentioned that has taken place under my observation upon the Route, from the

²³ Upon their arrival in the West, a good many of the Creek encamped near Fort Gibson and remained there through the winter. They were given food enough to sustain them until spring, when most of them removed to the lands intended for them and established their homes. For an account of the position of this military post on the Indian frontier, see Grant Foreman, *Fort Gibson: A Brief History* (Norman, 1936).

²⁴ The muster roll kept by Lieutenant Deas has not been found among the records of the Office of Indian Affairs now in The National Archives. However, there is a roll prepared by Captain Stephenson on the arrival of this party at Fort Gibson; it is filed with OIA, Creek Emigration, S-118/1836. Like the aforementioned contractors' roll, the Stephenson roll lists the names of heads of families, and the numbers of Indians by sex and by age—under ten, of ten and under twenty-five, of twenty-five and under fifty, and over fifty. The number of slaves is given, with indication as to their sex. There is a column for the total number of Creek and their slaves. The column headed "Remarks" contains the date of the arrival in the West and lists the total number of Creek by family groups. The Stephenson roll contains a supplement of six families who emigrated on "their own resources," arriving within a few days after the Deas party. This roll is really Stephenson's subsistence record for the first quarter of 1836, and for that reason the names of the later emigrants are added.

time the Party of Indians left the Creek Nation, Alabama, until they were to-day received by Capt. J. R. Stephenson in the new Country west of Fort Gibson, the 4th of February 1836.

EDW. DEAS

2nd Lieut. and

Disbg. Agent in the
Creek Emigration

The Creeks arrived in the West in a state of mixed emotions. Though broken in spirit and morale, they brought with them the conviction that at last they were far enough removed from the white man so that they could live thereafter in comparative freedom. For a while the strange surroundings and problems of adjustment to unfamiliar conditions and methods of living were bewildering; but gradually they entered into an era of reconstruction and improvement, an era in which they laid the foundations of a new nation.²⁵ For two thirds of a century their little republic served well the needs of its people and, finally, gave itself and its heritage to the formation of another American commonwealth.

²⁵ Occasional contributions have been made to the history of the Creek in the Indian Territory, among which are Grant Foreman, *The Five Civilized Tribes* (Norman, 1934), 147-219; Ohland Morton, "The Government of the Creek Nation," in *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Oklahoma City, 1921-), VIII (1930), 42-64, 189-225. A tribal history of the Creek has been written by Dr. Angie Debo as a companion volume to her *Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic* (Norman, 1934). It is soon to be published by the University of Oklahoma Press, under the title "The Road to Disappearance."

Book Reviews

French Pioneers in the West Indies, 1624-1664. By Nellis M. Crouse. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. vii, 294. Bibliography, maps, appendix. \$3.50.)

European nations and their offspring in the New World have been intensely interested in the islands of the Caribbean since the period of discovery. The Greater Antilles were the bases from which Spanish explorers and conquerors sailed to South America, Central America, Mexico, and the northern Gulf coast. Buccaneers haunted the Caribbean in the sixteenth century, and by 1625 France and England had become rivals in challenging Spanish title to the islands.

France held the advantage in acquiring these island outposts which poured so much wealth into Europe in the eighteenth century and which played so large a part in the titanic struggle for empire. The French supremacy was largely the result of the work of D'Esnambuc, De Poincy, Du Parquet, and Houël. Their activities form the subject matter of this volume. Pioneering under insular conditions produced social and economic patterns worthy of serious study, but Mr. Crouse has almost ignored these important aspects of pioneer settlements in the Caribbees. He has, however, presented a lucid, compact account of how the French came to acquire their Caribbee islands, and why the Company of the Isles of America sold them in three groups to the governors who remained as proprietors until the West India Company was chartered. Therein lies the principal value of this book which apparently is not the product of archival research.

The author has an easy, flowing style that carries the narrative smoothly; but too much attention to minor details occasionally obscures the main theme. The sad fate of the Sieur des Mares, Charles Houël's intrigue against Aubert whom he replaced as governor of Guadeloupe, and the machinations of Mlle de la Fayolle, are given too much attention. The two chapters describing the dreary details of De Thoisy's troubles with De Poincy and Houël from 1645 to 1647 might well have been compressed. Footnotes are few and scattered, but the annotated bibliography of less than forty titles lists the standard published sources in French and a few in English.

Louisiana State University

HARRIS GAYLORD WARREN

The First Gentlemen of Virginia: Intellectual Qualities of the Early Colonial Ruling Class. By Louis B. Wright. (San Marino, California: The Huntington Library, 1940. Pp. xi, 373. \$3.75.)

This readable study of the intellectual qualities of the early colonial ruling class is a temperate and perceptive analysis of a problem which has been unnecessarily obscured by the writers in the field of Virginia history. It has been neglected by the proponents of the plebeian reaction to the moonlight and magnolia school; it has been overstressed and little understood by the emotional defenders of the Cavalier; yet it is essential to any comprehension of the milieu of the class that supplied such brilliant leadership to Revolution and new Republic. As Mr. Wright states in his chapter on the development of Virginia aristocracy, "If realistic historians, revolting at the nonsense of many genealogical claims, have been moved to emphasize the essentially plebeian quality of the vast majority of Virginia settlers, we must not forget that the men who ruled the colony from its inception made up an aristocracy whose power and influence were out of all proportion to their numbers. . . . Though latter-day worshipers of democracy may discern the seeds of popular government in colonial Virginia, actually the government, from the first settlement to the Revolution, was aristocratic, even oligarchic."

There were early English patterns for the Virginia planter, but a native pattern of gentility emerged, "adapted to the nature of the country by the gentlemen there," as the Reverend Hugh Jones wrote of the architecture of early Virginia.

In the six chapters devoted to portraits of these early gentlemen of Virginia, Mr. Wright shows clearly his grasp of the civilization of which they were both the creators and the created. Of particular interest is his account of Byrd's progress from trade to genteel elegance; and of Robert Beverley II, "historian and iconoclast."

If one is impressed by a tendency to overstress the literary tastes of the early Virginians, the answer is to be found less in the author's limitations than in the nature of surviving seventeenth century records. It may account, also, for his lack of evidence of those "Attic societies" which developed in the early eighteenth century, and to which Thomas Jefferson attributed more instruction in his youth than "in all his life beside."

It is as difficult to measure Virginian intellectual achievement of the seventeenth century by its literary taste as it is to measure that of the eighteenth century by its literary output. There are too many intangibles and imponderables, but the evidence persists that an aristocratic society with a developed sense of social responsibility expended in social intercourse much of its effort and even intellectual force. In such a way, rather than in teaching and lectures alone, did such men as George Wythe, William Small, and Francis Fauquier educate a group of wellborn and competent young men destined for the public careers

which their class accepted as part of its tradition. They in turn created a place for such promising young men as Francis Walker Gilmer in their circle.

This is a good work, and one will welcome Mr. Wright's further studies of the letters of Robert Carter, and particularly his forthcoming work on the secret diaries of William Byrd of Westover. To this critic there seems to be, however, a slight dilution of the full flavor of the century in Mr. Wright's practice of "normalizing" the spelling and punctuation of his quoted sources; and even at the price of being considered among the last of the antiquarians, one might protest against it. Might it not lead also to some of the same type of normalizing that leads him to write Nathaniel Walthoe as Waltham, or to miss other nice distinctions in the contemporary "whimsical orthography"?

University of Virginia

HELEN DUPREY BULLOCK

Torchbearer of the Revolution: The Story of Bacon's Rebellion and Its Leader.

By Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. vii, 237. Bibliography, map. \$2.50.)

In his *Virginia under the Stuarts* (1914) Professor Wertenbaker wrote an account of Bacon's Rebellion which has continued to rank as the most authoritative study of this notable episode in Virginia's early colonial period. Now Professor Wertenbaker has rewritten the story in more detail with more emphasis on interpretation, as the title suggests, and without benefit (or distraction) of footnotes. He has given us a comprehensive picture of economic and social life in Virginia, especially during the years following the Restoration, of the Indian problem, and of the development and aftermath of the rebellion. The "Essay on Authorities" is indispensable for further study of this period. A fictitious character, Peter Bottom, is used to illustrate how many a poor immigrant made the most of the opportunity in "this democratic type of society" (p. 13) to become a worthy yeoman eligible to membership in the House of Burgesses. In contrast to these economic and political advantages is Governor Berkeley's repressive policy on regaining office in 1660—inequitable taxes, land-grabbing by men of influence, excessive cost of public works, the Governor's indecisive attitude toward threats and depredations of the Indians, and his subservient "Long Assembly" of 1661-1675. The English navigation laws are stressed as a serious grievance because of their adverse effect upon the colony's farmers and merchants.

Into this scene steps the youthful Nathaniel Bacon, a newcomer to the colony, whose character is penetratingly and sympathetically portrayed. In view of his aristocratic family and environment, his early irresponsibility and improvidence, Bacon's brief career as popular leader in Virginia becomes the more significant. Governor Berkeley's policy of vacillation, encouraging the Indians to terrorize the frontier, resulted in an organization of volunteers to march against the

savages southwest of the James and Appomattox. Bacon, the squire of Henrico, to whom "the poor people came" for help, was acclaimed leader and, without a commission from the Governor, led them to victory. As a matter of expediency, Berkeley granted Bacon a parole on his return to Jamestown; but when no other concessions were forthcoming in the face of further Indian incursions, Bacon broke his parole and returned to his followers. Thus the Indian campaign led rapidly to open war between Bacon and the Governor and to Bacon's brief control of the government. Professor Wertebaker sees Bacon not as a rebel but as a patriot who raised the vital issue of "whether England's greatest colony was to be democratic or aristocratic" (p. 34). Berkeley suffers badly by comparison. It is suggested that he probably appointed Bacon to the Council as a bribe and that the Governor should go down in history as "Berkeley the Executioner" for the vengeance he indulged in after the rebellion was overcome.

The author shows conclusively that the long accumulation of grievances produced a spontaneous support of the popular leader when he appeared. It seems clear that Bacon was no demagogue and that he won the allegiance of many planters as well as small farmers. "He had become, unexpectedly and against his own wishes, the Cromwell of the colony" (p. 129). Realizing that eventually he would have to face attack by royal troops, he proposed that his men take an oath to resist the King's army and he even had hopes of persuading Maryland and North Carolina to unite with him. The fact that the rebellion was not put down quickly even after Bacon's death indicates how deep-seated was the antagonism toward the Governor and his favorites. This reviewer questions, however, the validity of a kinship between Bacon's Rebellion and the American Revolution because "both had as the main principle the defense of American rights" (p. 209). "American" rights in 1676 would be difficult to define. Most of Bacon's reforms were directed against tyranny and corruption which Englishmen had often resisted in previous centuries. As for free manhood suffrage which was briefly enjoyed during Bacon's regime, this was not one of the rights of Englishmen or of Americans generally at the time of the Revolution or of Virginians until 1851. The grievances over English commercial policy were beyond the control of Virginia and were not a subject for legislation by Bacon's Assembly. The rebellion challenged a reactionary government with force of arms, but the main issue was not democracy versus aristocracy.

University of Virginia

LESTER J. CAPON

Topographic Terms in Virginia. American Speech Reprints and Monographs, No. 3. By George Davis McJimsey. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. 151. Bibliography. \$2.00.)

This small but information-packed volume was produced as a systematic study in a narrow segment of linguistic science, but its value to the scholarly world

overflows philological banks into the realms of such distantly related intellectual disciplines as geography, geology, and history. It consists chiefly of a thirty-five-page introduction, carefully outlined and clearly explanatory, and of a hundred-page glossary of topographic nouns.

In his comprehensive introduction the author employs the racial and historical, as well as linguistic and topographical, approaches to the origins and evolutions of the nomenclature with which he is concerned. To mention just a few of his less technical etymological findings, one learns that the meanings of the English words *bar*, *creek*, and *dam* were enlarged by being transplanted into Virginia, while *branch* developed a restricted connotation; that *fen* evidently did not migrate with the colonists at all and *bog* became limited in meaning, so that *swamp* (perhaps a provincial, vernacular term now obsolete in British English) and *pocosin* (borrowed from the Indians) were substituted, the latter word remaining inexplicably rather local in usage; that *divide*, *lick*, and *wallow* originated in Virginia by diminution of nontopographic terms such as *dividing ground* and *licking place*; and that the synonymous words *prairie* and *savannah* were adopted from the French and Spanish (or Indians), respectively, the former being a late importation brought by frontiersmen returning from the Old Northwest. Noteworthy comparisons of Virginia terminology are made with the principal English and American dictionaries, even those covering colloquialisms. Perhaps the most useful portion of the introduction presents an analysis of the synonymous terms which describe such topographic features as bodies of water, lands bordering water, elevations, watercourses, and forested areas.

The glossary has 737 entries, comprises definitions and dated, condensed quotations illustrative of varying contextual usages of each word, and gives adequate citation to each quoted occurrence of the term. In his assuredly laborious quest for such quotations, the painstaking compiler searched government documents, newspapers, diaries, journals of travelers, and sundry descriptive works, ranging in chronology from the writings of Captain John Smith through those of William Byrd, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson, to the most recent gazetteers, local historical and social studies, and geological surveys. Of primary importance among these, because they proved most fruitful to the investigator, were the manuscript land office records and county records. As a single sample of the glossary's utility, it may be mentioned that ten quoted sources, covering the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries, show that *garden*, meaning in one sense a region of remarkable fertility, was used interchangeably in Virginia with *valley*.

Probably few historians will be able to muster any appreciable interest in this study, but surely there must be many who would profit by using it, even unenthusiastically, as a work of reference or as a tool.

The Background of the Revolution in Maryland. By Charles Albro Barker.
(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. Pp. xi, 419. Bibliography, appendix. \$3.50.)

Dr. Barker's work is hardly what its title implies. Rather it describes in detail the political, social, and economic history of Maryland from 1715 to 1774. The author has diligently consulted a large body of manuscript and printed sources, newspapers, and much secondary material, unearthed new facts of value to the student, and compiled an excellent bibliography on Maryland eighteenth century history.

His work is well arranged, though his style is at times somewhat involved and hard to read. The first three chapters are concerned with economic and social life, and include population statistics; influence of geographic environment; a description of frontier and tidewater life; alien populations, particularly the Germans of western Maryland; indentured and slave classes; the landed gentry; morals, amusements, and literary beginnings; economic life in which the cultivation and sale of tobacco played a great part; the British factor; attempts to diversify the colony's industry; and Maryland's overseas trade.

The last seven chapters are devoted to that popular and important topic which engrosses the attention of most authors of this period of colonial history—the contest between the lower house with its local and parliamentary viewpoint and the upper house, governor, king or proprietor with the prerogative viewpoint. Dr. Barker gives the greater part of his book to this struggle, which differs in detail from that in other proprietary and royal colonies while following the same general pattern. In Maryland as in Pennsylvania the lower house carried the attack to the proprietor who, standing on the rights explicitly stated in his charter, fought a losing battle with the ever more powerful representatives of the people.

Dr. Barker's reasoning on the whole is scholarly and meticulous but not always conclusive. For instance, on pages 95-96 he speaks of the effort to secure diversified industries in addition to the staple crop tobacco and cites the passage of certain laws—a bounty to encourage the growing of hemp, a bounty for the manufacture of linen, and laws releasing whites from musters or road building if they were engaged in iron and copper industries. Such evidence hardly warrants the conclusion, "This legislation plainly indicates widespread interest in economic diversification."

Again on pages 96-97 he discusses export trade and enumerates sixty vessels owned by Maryland totaling around two thousand tons, or an average of about thirty-three tons each. Could such small ships have been used in overseas trade or even trade to the West Indies? The Jay Treaty of 1794 confined the commerce of United States vessels with the British West Indies to ships of not over seventy tons burden with the plain intention of preventing them from carrying West Indian products overseas.

It might also be said that Dr. Barker has not sufficiently pointed his material toward the Revolution, leaving it to the reader himself to make the connection. More might have been included about the personalities of Maryland leaders, their aims, kinships, friendships, and rivalries, and greater emphasis might also have been placed on the religious issue during a period in which Maryland was moving rapidly toward the disestablishment of the church.

Much of the material has already appeared in the works of Newton D. Mereness, Beverly W. Bond, Clarence P. Gould, Kathryn T. Behrens, St. George L. Sioussat, Ventrees J. Wyckoff, Eugene I. McCormac, and Paul H. Giddens. Dr. Barker's work is therefore a reconsideration and rearrangement of the whole with important additions and new interpretations.

University of Maryland

HAYES BAKER-CROTHERS

Washington and the Revolution: A Reappraisal; Gates, Conway, and the Continental Congress. By Bernhard Knollenberg. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940. Pp. xvi, 269. Frontispiece, bibliography, appendices. \$3.00.)

Neither the title nor the subtitle gives a satisfactory idea of the contents of this book. Mr. Knollenberg does not pretend to write a detailed account of Washington's connection with the American Revolution, nor does he offer a final appraisal of the importance of the man to the movement. The volume consists of a series of separate studies, carefully documented and aimed at sweeping away certain specific traditions in the historiography of the War for Independence. In the author's words, the "book dissents from the conventional presentation of Gates, Conway, and the Continental Congress, and also of Washington himself. . . . It reveals Washington's hypersensitiveness to criticism and morbid determination to prove himself always in the right; traits which led him to shift responsibility for his errors to others and to be unduly suspicious of the motives of those who ventured to criticize or differ with him." He concludes "that the Revolution was won, not despite, but with the help of the Continental Congress, Gates, and others commonly accused of having hampered Washington" (p. x).

Though explicitly recognizing the great qualities of the Commander in Chief, Mr. Knollenberg has "rejected the conventional view as to the unimpeachability of Washington's statements and, while giving weight to them, . . . [has] taken pains to check their accuracy against all other available, contemporaneous evidence" (p. ix). The author has confined himself to contemporary sources, has subjected each one to a process of merciless examination which gives evidence of his legal training, and has found frequent occasion to comment scornfully upon historians who have been less critical in accepting the sometimes unreliable accounts in secondary works.

Part of his task is easy. His particular animus is directed against Fitzpatrick's *George Washington Himself* as an example of the neo-Bancroft school of unre-

served hero worship, and he finds little difficulty, for instance, in demolishing Fitzpatrick's assertion that the French alliance was effectuated not as a result of Gates' victory at Saratoga but in consequence of Gérard's personal acquaintance with Washington. The author is also persuasive and intelligent in demonstrating that the replacement of Schuyler by Gates in the northern command, far from being the result of a conspiracy, as is often asserted, was rendered almost inevitable by the distrust that had arisen between the New York commander and the New England troops—a distrust based primarily on their sharply contrasting political and social traditions.

In general, Mr. Knollenberg's rehabilitation of Gates, a process not pushed to immoderate lengths, is successful. Having accomplished this, he turns to the most important single subject in the volume, the "Conway Cabal." He states his view in advance—"In my opinion the Conway Cabal is probably a myth"—and then proceeds to justify it. He makes out a convincing case, and the documents which he marshals convict Washington as well as Conway of short temper and bad manners. In summarizing his findings concerning the attitude of Congress, the author declares that, although there was widespread criticism of Washington and his supposed mistakes by the end of 1777, there is no evidence of a plot against him. "Since Congress was the chief executive," he reminds us, "as well as the chief legislative body, the consideration and discussion of Washington . . . was a congressman's duty. Even if a bloc of them had favored Washington's removal, this would not have been a cabal in any ordinary sense of the word, for if a congressman believed it to be for the best interests of the United States that Washington be removed, he would have been subject to censure for failing to act, not for acting, on his conviction" (p. 71).

It may be argued that, after absolving Gates of participation in a cabal, Mr. Knollenberg goes too far in the other direction, with his assertion (p. 75) that "as to Gates, there is not the slightest evidence in his letters or elsewhere that he was hostile to Washington or concerned in any project to displace him." If Gates was not known to be at least somewhat unfriendly to the Commander in Chief, it is extraordinary that at least three persons should have seen fit to write him letters as highly uncomplimentary to Washington as those quoted in this book (pp. 51, 63, 195), which are not the only ones of this tenor that he received. To admit frankly that the hero of Saratoga was probably not well disposed to his superior would not weaken Mr. Knollenberg's general case, and would strengthen the reader's confidence in his impartiality.

One may occasionally question Mr. Knollenberg's use of evidence, particularly in the chapter on the fall of Fort Washington in November, 1776. Although the evidence which the author cites and the evidence which might be cited in refutation are too extensive for inclusion in this review, the reviewer believes that Mr. Knollenberg is not successful in pinning upon the Commander in Chief responsibility for the débâcle on the Hudson.

Despite such objections to certain aspects of *Washington and the Revolution*, the appearance of the volume should be welcomed. It is a proof of the continuing vitality of our democracy in time of stress that we are not afraid to re-examine any period of our national history, and to look critically at the careers and personalities of our greatest figures. We may draw courage in our present perplexities from the realization that our infant nation was saved not by demigods or by beings of a superior breed that has since vanished from the earth, but by men as beset as we are with human frailties—possessed, however, in marked degree, of such redeeming and essential qualities as courage and endurance.

Indiana University

LEONARD LUNDIN

The Loyalists in North Carolina During the Revolution. By Robert O. DeMond. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1940. Pp. ix, 286. Bibliography, appendices. \$3.00.)

For several decades historians have devoted attention to the Loyalists both in general and also in certain of the states, and the current vogue of Kenneth Roberts' fine novel, *Oliver Wiswell*, has served to focus popular attention on the subject. As Dr. DeMond points out, however, in spite of the fact that "North Carolina probably contained a greater number of Loyalists in proportion to its population than did any other colony," that they, "unaided by British troops, accomplished more than did the Loyalists of any other colony, and that North Carolina furnished in Colonel John Hamilton the most important Tory leader of the Revolution," the history of Loyalism in this state has never received detailed treatment until the publication of the present work. "This neglect may have resulted from the fact that at the time of the Revolution North Carolina lacked large towns and her newspapers were few."

Beginning with the colonial background, the author has properly laid emphasis on the Regulator movement, which caused a large proportion of the population of the back country either actively or passively to oppose the Revolution a few years later. Events leading up to the Revolution are next covered, followed by an account of Loyalist military activities during the war. Due prominence is given to the important Whig victory of Moore's Creek Bridge, early in 1776, and to the Whig-Tory civil war which was a corollary of Cornwallis' invasion of the state in 1780-1781. A discussion follows of anti-Loyalist legislation and the confiscation of Tory property, after which there are chapters on the exodus of the Loyalists and the compensation which they received from the British government. Useful appendices contain lists of the North Carolina Loyalists, of their confiscated lands, of their claims against and allowances from the British government, and of their pension rolls. A bibliography, partly critical, shows that the study has been based primarily upon *The Colonial* [and

State] *Records of North Carolina* and upon the North Carolina Historical Commission's transcripts and photostats from the British Public Record Office.

One can wish that the job had been better done. The name of Thomas Person is twice misspelled (pp. 35, 48); reference is made to Forsyth, Gaston, Randolph, and other counties as existing before the Revolution (p. 54), when actually they were not formed until later; "Robert Roman" (p. 79) should be "Robert Rowan"; the North Carolina Historical Commission is incorrectly referred to as the "Historical Society, Raleigh, N. C." (p. 263); and there are numerous other careless minor errors. Probably colonial North Carolina was not in such perpetual turmoil as is indicated in Chapter I. It is true that during the proprietary period, which ended in 1729, there were revolts and political squabbles, but by the middle of the eighteenth century the situation had changed so that the province hardly suffered from more political unrest than does any normal, growing body politic. The topical organization of the material causes the reader to go over the same ground several times from different points of view, with the result that, for purposes of illustration, he is repeatedly referred to the same persons and events. But the book will serve a useful purpose, and scholars will be glad that it is available.

North Carolina Historical Commission

C. C. CRITTENDEN

The Stewardship of Don Esteban Miró, 1782-1792. A Study of Louisiana Based Largely on the Documents in New Orleans. By Caroline Maude Burson. (New Orleans: American Printing Company, Ltd., 1940. Pp. xi, 327. Bibliography, frontispiece, table. \$3.00.)

The time of Miró's "stewardship" as governor of Louisiana (1782-1792) spanned the transition of the revolting North American colonies from a colonial status to that of an independent nation. It was this change that created many of Miró's most pressing and difficult problems. In this account the author is more concerned with local problems of government and administration than with the larger and, in the end, more important problems surrounding relations with the new Republic to the North.

The treatment is topical rather than strictly chronological, covering such subjects as the military defense of the province of Louisiana, agriculture, the Negroes, both slave and free, the law, civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, etc. There is a chapter on "English Relations," but none on relations with the United States except as they are a part of the struggle for the Mississippi and the colonizing schemes of Morgan and O'Fallon and their associates.

There is hardly any mention of the function of the Mississippi River as a roadway and of the port of New Orleans as an outlet for American products and of their bearing on the intrigues beginning with General Wilkinson's first trip to New Orleans and continuing for the next ten years and more. The

trading schemes of Wilkinson and others are discussed in considerable detail from the standpoint of the individual traders rather than from the broader viewpoint of why they were insisting on trading and colonizing rights.

Miró, born about 1744, died in Spain on June 4, 1795, as much from the effects of "atrocious calumnies . . . circulated" against him in New Orleans and in Spain as for any other reason. He retired from the governorship under a cloud that was not lifted by his death. The author has a great admiration for the man and while defending him against his enemies, admits that some of the charges against him may have been at least partially true. To offset her description of Miró as "a gentleman who refused to take himself too seriously" (p. 188), she quotes approvingly a description of Wilkinson as one able "to conciliate and win to his friendship many of the people of the day," one "endowed . . . with a passport which insured his favorable reception wherever he was seen and heard" (p. 151).

This book is essentially an account of the civil administration of New Orleans and the adjacent territory for the period from 1782 to 1792, and of the hierarchy and relative responsibilities of the Spanish officials at New Orleans. As such it is a valuable contribution to the history of the period.

There are a number of typographical errors, none of them important; many citations are incomplete except by inference and frequently a title is cited without page reference. One principal criticism of many citations is that only Miró's communications to the Spanish court are given with no indication as to whether the communications cited have been published elsewhere or are otherwise available. There is an extended bibliography of manuscripts, newspapers, and printed works used.

Port Washington, New York

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Thomas Spalding of Sapelo. By E. Merton Coulter. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1940. Pp. xii, 334. Bibliography, illustrations, map. \$3.00.)

No part of Georgia has a more interesting and colorful past than the sea-coast, with its chain of wooded islands extending from the Savannah to the Saint Marys River and separated from the mainland by the broad quiet waters of inland channels. The tidal rivers, salt marshes, pine forests, great oaks with their festoons of moss, with crepe myrtle, magnolia, and jessamine to give perfume and color, constitute a prospect that is altogether pleasing. Even Fanny Kemble was moved by the physical beauty of the region. Cumberland, Jekyl, Saint Simon, Sapelo, Doboy, Saint Catherines—the very names of the islands excite the imagination. Across the pages of its history move Spanish explorers and Jesuit missionaries, James Oglethorpe, the Wesleys, George Whitefield, European soldiers and sailors fighting for an empire in the New World. Detached from the

inland cotton belt by the pine barrens, the seacoast developed a society and economy distinctive in flavor and pattern. Such is the physical setting of this biography, and such was the region beloved by Thomas Spalding. Here he was born, in 1774, and here he died, in 1851.

In reading the varied sources of ante-bellum Georgia history it is difficult to avoid the name of Thomas Spalding. If it is the history of the culture of sugar cane, cotton, or rice, one reads articles and pamphlets written by him; railroad building and other internal improvements have his name in their records; he made his contribution to banking; and the annals of politics, state and national, carry his name as well.

A man of no literary pretensions, Spalding has left a notable bibliography, more than enough to establish him as a person worthy of historical consideration. The *American Agriculturist* (New York) published nine of his contributions, the *Southern Agriculturist* (Charleston) contained great numbers of his articles, and the *Southern Cultivator* (Augusta) served as an outlet for other of his writings on agricultural topics. In addition to these and other periodicals, Spalding wrote for many newspapers. His "Sketch of the Life of General James Oglethorpe" was published in the first volume of the Georgia Historical Society *Collections*, and a briefer work, a memoir of General Lachlan McIntosh, appeared in *The National Portrait Gallery of Distinguished Americans*.

A large planter and slaveowner, Spalding experimented with one staple after another. Sea-island cotton, rice, and sugar cane interested him particularly. His experience with the cultivation of the last and the manufacture of sugar was published in pamphlet form in 1816 by the South Carolina Agricultural Society.

Although a member of the United States Congress, the Georgia Senate, and president of several political conventions, politics was not Spalding's chief interest. He was a follower of Troup, a state rights Democrat in national politics, and a supporter of compromise and the Union in 1850, but his real interest was the improvement of agriculture and regional economy. He loved his island kingdom, his family, his slaves, and his neighbors, and he gave freely of his knowledge and experience in planting so that the community and region would benefit. An apostle of diversification, many of his utterances were prophetic of a later plight.

This is more than the biography of a local figure or a lengthy footnote to a study of a broader scope. True it is that Thomas Spalding spent his life on the Georgia seacoast, but the contribution he made was far more widespread. The book is well balanced, scholarly, and interestingly written, not surprising to those familiar with the author's previous works, and the illustrations add to the attractiveness of the volume. *Thomas Spalding of Sapelo* is the third volume published in the *Southern Biography Series*, edited by Wendell H. Stephenson and Fred C. Cole.

Edward Livingston, Jeffersonian Republican and Jacksonian Democrat. By William B. Hatcher. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1940. Pp. xiv, 518. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.50.)

This comprehensive and scholarly biography of Edward Livingston portrays the life, activities, and thoughts of a man who was significant in local politics in two regions, New York and Louisiana, in national politics in two important eras, 1795-1801 and 1823-1831, and in international politics, 1831-1835. The work reveals that in addition to his active and insufficiently appreciated political career, Livingston found time to develop a profitable real estate project in New Orleans, to serve as Andrew Jackson's aide-de-camp in the New Orleans campaign of 1814-1815, to engage regularly in the practice of law, and to integrate the various codes of law in use in his adopted state of Louisiana. Throughout the account the author has provided an adequate setting for his subject's actions, clarifying and explaining his course without an announced and obvious interpretation.

Professor Hatcher traces logically and clearly the rise of Livingston, scion of an eminent New York family, through the intricacies of local and family politics in the Empire state to a seat in the national House of Representatives which he held from 1795 to 1801; through the Jefferson-Burr contest of 1801 to Jefferson's attention and favors; and back again to New York as mayor of that city and United States attorney for the District of New York in 1801. In the capacity of district attorney Livingston's lax supervision permitted a subordinate to embezzle a huge sum of money, thereby bringing political disgrace to his superior. Livingston accepted a debt of \$100,000 to the Federal government, probably more than twice the amount of the actual shortage, and resigned from his public offices. Also, he fell from the favor of Jefferson who was to remain unfriendly for many years.

The author, following Livingston in his efforts to rehabilitate himself professionally and financially, shifts the scene to the territory of Orleans in 1804. The recently acquired territory was plagued with problems of conflicting land titles, social and ethnic complexities, and confusing legal codes. Livingston's contributions and services to his adopted home, extending from 1804 to 1831, are not only ably revealed but are used as vehicles to clarify the early problems of the territory and the state. His efforts to acquire property rights along the river front in New Orleans require an explanation of old land titles; his return to political activity in the territory and state necessitates an explanation of the social and ethnic conflicts; his services to Andrew Jackson in the New Orleans campaign afford an opportunity to indicate the precarious rifts that existed in and about New Orleans; and his legal activities enable the author to present the confusing legal codes and to relate Livingston's part in codifying them. All of this Professor Hatcher has done admirably, although this reviewer suspects that only a

legally trained reader will appreciate fully Livingston's task in codifying the laws or the author's account of that accomplishment.

Again, the reader is transferred to the national political scene with Livingston's return to the House of Representatives in 1823, now representing Louisiana. After an interval of twenty-two years, he found a new generation of colleagues, but his added experience enabled him to gain their respect with ease. His association with Jackson in 1815 and the rising tide of Jackson's popularity improved his political position. With Jackson's aid he was elected to the United States Senate in 1829, only to be lifted from it in 1831 to assume the mantle of secretary of state.

Thereafter, Livingston's roles as secretary of state and as minister to France consume the closing chapters of the book. These tasks, Professor Hatcher shows, were performed with credit. While secretary of state he formulated the part of Jackson's message to Congress in December of 1832 that dealt with South Carolina's effort to nullify the tariff act of that year, and therein gave Jackson an effective refutation of the state rights doctrine. His mission to France was particularly noteworthy because he laid the groundwork for the successful termination of the delicate question of the French spoliation claims.

This is one of the finest biographies written in recent years. It is scholarly, inclusive, compact, and well balanced. The 467 pages of text contain a complete account of the actions and thoughts of a versatile and significant man from the time of the formation of the Republic to 1835, including the eras of Jeffersonian Republicanism and Jacksonian Democracy. The "Critical Essay on Authorities," 29 pages in length, is more than an adequate bibliography; it is a contribution in itself. The index is adequate; the format is laudable; and the style is dignified, if not spritely.

Students of the history of the United States, and particularly students of the early history of New York and of Louisiana, are indebted to Professor Hatcher for his fine contribution to American historiography. This volume sets a high standard for the *Southern Biography Series*.

University of Pittsburgh

RUSSELL J. FERGUSON

Pistols at Ten Paces: The Story of the Code of Honor in America. By William Oliver Stevens. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940. Pp. ix, 293. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

The duel, a social practice common in the United States during the century 1770 to 1870, has been defined as "a private fight between two persons, pre-arranged and fought with deadly weapons, usually in presence of two witnesses called seconds, who regulate the mode of fighting and enforce the rules agreed upon, having for its object to decide a personal quarrel or to settle a point of honor." The all-encompassing story of the *Code Duello* will probably never be told; the sources are too numerous and too fugitive.

In *Pistols at Ten Paces* Mr. Stevens has written an excellent volume in a conservatively journalistic style for the casual lay reader. Following a brief introduction and discussion of the colonial and Revolutionary eras he carries the story through the South's period of ante-bellum greatness to the beginning of the 1860's. He then returns to the topical form under such headings as "Killing by Etiquette," "Plain Killing," and continues with several duels fought between famous Americans. The volume closes with a discussion of the Civil War period and a chapter entitled "The Anti-Climax of the Code." A half dozen photographs lend pictorial interest to the volume.

To the historian who must be more exacting in his analysis the work is far from satisfying. The author is, on the one hand, very accurate in his descriptions and judgments, and, on the other, makes astoundingly inaccurate statements and generalizations. While it is not possible to check the sources used owing to the lack of bibliography or footnotes, it is clear that state constitutions and statutes have not been used; key magazines and newspapers (i.e., *New Orleans Picayune*, *Niles' Weekly Register*, *Magazine of American History*, etc.) seem to have been touched but lightly; and the numberless isolated sources appear to have been largely overlooked. Many observations are completely in error, one example of which will suffice. Contrary to the author, the English heritage in the development of American dueling was important. At least nine British prime ministers fought duels; there were over one hundred fifty "affairs" during the reign of George III in which over fifty duelists lost their lives; and it must be admitted that the judicial combat was not removed from English law until the 1820's. Many misconceptions should have been explained in more detail. "Pistols in the morning" is a loose term, too often misconstrued; in certain localities large audiences were common (over one thousand people witnessed a Natchez duel in 1837); the codes were not always followed; weapons and particulars were frequently exaggerated and unusual. The mechanics of the duel are wholly neglected; the challenge, practice (sometimes with cork balls), duties of the seconds (position, sun, wind, elevation, clothing, search for padding, etc.), distances, and many other details were all involved on a formal occasion. The sins are those of omission rather than commission, and are too numerous to be listed in a book review.

Louisiana State University

EDWIN ADAMS DAVIS

Tixier's Travels on the Osage Prairies. Edited by John Francis McDermott and translated from the French by Albert J. Salvan. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1940. Pp. xv, 309. Illustrations, Osage glossary, bibliography, maps. \$3.00.)

Border Captives: The Traffic in Prisoners by Southern Plains Indians, 1835-1875. By Carl Coke Rister. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1940. Pp. xi, 220. Illustrations, bibliography, maps. \$2.00.)

Probably many difficult problems concerning classification of books arise

with bibliographers and publishers. The two books under consideration are from the University of Oklahoma Press, and it would seem that both might appropriately have been included in the *Civilization of the American Indian Series*, for which this press is best known; yet neither volume is so catalogued. This comment is not made in criticism, but is instead a means of commendation, for both these books deal in a scholarly and informative manner with Indian culture, even to the intimate way of life.

Tixier's Travels on the Osage Prairies in reaching its present form, edited by Professor John Francis McDermott and translated by Professor Albert J. Salvan, has its own dramatic history not equalled by Professor Carl Coke Rister's monograph, *Border Captives*. It was indeed a fortunate accident for western Americana that almost a century ago a young French medical student, one Victor Tixier, injured a finger, for thereby a fortuitous chain of circumstances was set up which eventually in 1844 produced his book, *Voyage aux prairies osages, Louisiane et Missouri, 1839-40*. The infected finger refused to heal; consequently Tixier dropped his studies and traveled to America for his health. He visited New Orleans, found Louisiana creole plantations of much interest and wrote admirable descriptions of steamboating on the Father of Waters to St. Louis. His account up to this point is an ordinary travelogue, but in St. Louis he chanced upon an invitation to visit with the Osages and to go with them on their summer hunt. He thrust aside all previous plans, even a projected visit to Niagara Falls, and set off, determined to live the summer of 1840 "like an Indian."

Tixier writes almost without emotion and with the keenness of a scientist over a microscope. From the time of his arrival at the Osage village, Ninon-Chou, the reader finds in the following 150 pages the finest detailed description of the way of life among the all-too-little-known Osages. Tixier's account does for the Osages what Richardson's *Comanche Barrier* did for the Comanches; it revises popular and even somewhat warped historical concepts of the "bloody" savage. One is not, however, offered instead an unreal, fictionized and glorified Uncas. It is an authentic picture of the Osage which emerges, some portions of which have to do with language, physical structure, general health, sanitation, diseases, manners, customs, taboos, family life, economic life (including a blending of nomadic and sedentary existence as both hunter and agriculturalist and at once both a capitalist and a communist), raiment, governmental structure, and relations with other tribes. Varying with the subjects Tixier writes as a philologist, physician, social anthropologist, sociologist, economist, political scientist, or internationalist, and yet withal and always as an objective philosopher. Probably no person other than a combined scientist and artist could have given Tixier's minute descriptions, and fortunately he was both.

The translator—usually the forgotten man—certainly deserves in this case special comment. The book reads as if it were originally composed in English—

which is the highest compliment that can be paid a translation. Professor Salvan dispensed with brackets and other supposed evidences of scholarship and fidelity, and the phraseology rings true to original meaning.

That the Tixier book makes a distinct contribution is best evidenced by the fact that it was not one of the sources used by Frederick W. Hodge in the *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*. This fact also testifies to its scarcity and fully justifies its reissue in present form. The use of Tixier's account would, at least, have forced some modifications in Hodge's classic account.

In *Border Captives* Professor Rister gives a new slant on the Indian raiders—mostly Comanche and Kiowa—of the period between 1835 and 1875. Raiding and particularly the taking of women and children captives was a lucrative business—it paid dividends in ransom money and was highly comparable to modern racketeering. Once the raiders returned to the reservations the forces of "law and order" paid the ransoms, and thus gave tacit encouragement to the perpetuation of this parasitical preying on society. Professor Rister relates the story of Cynthia Ann Parker and many other somewhat similar, but not so well-known, incidents of the capture of whites by Indians. He gives valuable information on the *Comancheros*, on the part played by the much-harried Indian agents, and reveals with good insight the hardihood of the frontier settlers matched in conflict by a like hardihood of the red men, as each fought according to the accepted traditions of his race.

Both Professor Rister's and Professor McDermott's scholarship leave nothing to be desired. Professor Rister knows well his locale, the Texas frontier, and his actors, the Comanche and the Kiowa, while Professor McDermott displays in his notes an intimate acquaintance with source materials dealing with the Mississippi Valley and the Osages proper. No passing reference of Tixier's has been too obscure to escape the editor's careful attention in identification and illumination. Professor Rister, always a pleasing stylist, is at his best in his opening chapters giving the setting of the book.

Taken together the two books are distinct contributions to the literature of western Americana and add much to available information on the Indian life in the areas, in the main, of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas after Anglo-American encroachment had set in so much as to be a major Indian problem. Although not too apparent the end of the traditional Indian way of life in the Southwest was, in both accounts, in sight.

Both books are in the customary good style and format by now almost assured with offerings of the University of Oklahoma Press.

University of Texas

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Cherokee Cavaliers: Forty Years of Cherokee History as Told in the Correspondence of the Ridge-Watie-Boudinot Family. By Edward Everett Dale and Gaston Litton. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939. Pp. xxiii, 319. Illustrations, table. \$3.00.)

If properly edited, the correspondence of almost any family extending over a comparatively long period would have some historical value. Certainly this collection of letters is both interesting and useful; for the people who contributed to it were, in the main, participants in some of the most important movements in American frontier history. The authors represent almost every station of life and stage of cultural development known to their day and time. In respect to race they range from Caucasian to pureblood Cherokee; in respect to literacy, from a few unschooled persons, whose letters are barely intelligible, to John Rollin Ridge, author and journalist of distinction; and in respect to importance, from obscure farmers and boys and girls in boarding schools to Stand Watie, the greatest Indian soldier of the Civil War and the last Confederate general to surrender. Measured by Anglo-Saxon standards of civilization these people would compare favorably with the best white families of their time. Their interests and their sympathies were, however, uniformly with their Indian kinsmen; and except where circumstances forced their removal, they continued to reside in the Cherokee Nation.

The correspondence here reproduced began in the 1830's, when the greater part of the Cherokee were in Georgia. At that time Major Ridge, his son, John Ridge, and Major Ridge's nephews, two brothers, known respectively as Elias Boudinot and Stand Watie, led the faction called the Treaty party. A feud which developed over the question of removal from Georgia to the Indian Territory apparently took on new life in the new soil of the West; and the two Ridges and Elias Boudinot were murdered in 1839. Their places were taken by younger members of the family, however, and the strife continued; the Ridge-Watie-Boudinot family leading one faction and John Ross the other. A compact of peace only caused the feud to smolder for a decade or more, and it was fanned into flames again by secession and Civil War. For the Cherokee, the struggle from 1861 to 1865 was truly a civil war, a war that did not cease with the dismissal of the troops in 1865.

Although many of the letters have to do with this internecine strife, fortunately but few are wholly confined to that subject. There are accounts of mining operations in California, where many Cherokee went during the gold rush; some ten letters are from E. C. Boudinot, the Cherokee delegate to the Confederate Congress at Richmond; from Rusk County, Texas, where with her children she had sought refuge, Mrs. Sarah C. Watie wrote of conditions during the war; the Watie children contribute interesting gossip from the boarding schools which they attended; and there is a mine of information on politics,

border relations, business, agriculture, and the way of life generally in the Cherokee Nation from about 1840 to 1872.

For the greater part of these letters the editors drew on a collection of more than two thousand, discovered in 1919, in a farmhouse near the home of General Stand Watie in northeastern Oklahoma. They are now in the Frank Phillips Collection of Southwestern History at the University of Oklahoma. The editors have done their work most excellently. They have divided the correspondence into seven periods beginning with "Removal and the Ross-Ridge Feud," and closing with "The Last Years of Stand Watie." The book begins with a general introduction which acquaints the reader with the subject in its broader aspects; and each chapter is introduced with a sketch of the particular era and theme it covers. Biographical sketches and other explanatory data in footnotes are adequate but not involved and tedious. Among other evidences of broad and intensive investigation is the genealogical table that is presented. The index is unusually thorough.

It is fitting that *Cherokee Cavaliers* should be published in the *Civilization of the American Indian* Series of the University of Oklahoma Press. "I want to write the history of the Cherokee Nation as it *Should* be written and not as white men will write it as they will tell the tale, to screen and justify themselves." Thus wrote John Rollin Ridge from California, an exile in a strange land but ever mindful of his beloved Cherokee. It was not given to the versatile Cherokee journalist to realize his dream. His history was never written; but in this volume Dale and Litton have given to his valiant protests in behalf of his people the enduring form which they deserve.

University of Texas

RUPERT N. RICHARDSON

I Rode with Stonewall: The War Experiences of the Youngest Member of Jackson's Staff. By Henry Kyd Douglas, with Biographical Sketch and Notes by Fletcher M. Green. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1940. Pp. xi, 401. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

One reads with mixed emotions as Henry Kyd Douglas pens his tale of his service on the staff of Stonewall Jackson. The reason for the mixed emotions is explained amply in the second paragraph of the preface, where an admission of comprehensive editing after many years explains the curious intermingling of youthful impulse and the mature and reflective philosophy of age which greets the reader from the printed page. How much better it would have been had the author refrained from polishing the little nuggets of truth which he held in trust for posterity. Once put to paper, memoirs belong to the generations to come. When old age pours temperate waters on the hot fires of youth, it becomes, in a way, a breach of trust. We are entitled to know *how* Douglas felt at the time, and *what* he felt about the stirring things that crowded in upon his con-

sciousness during those few days he actually did ride with Stonewall. It is a lasting pity that Mr. Douglas saw fit to edit his manuscript in later years beyond the correction of factual error and the improvement of rhetorical flourish.

But I like the book in spite of this oft-repeated literary crime. Kyd Douglas has the heaven-sent gift of word painting and of looking somewhat deeper into the souls of men than most biographers. He provokes more than casual interest with his gift for making the actors live again—not as memory figures, will-o'-the-wisps—but as pulsating human beings. We are almost ready to shake hands with Ewell, to quarrel with D. H. Hill over his temperance views, and to hold Lee's cloak before he ventures forth into a stormy night.

The tale is well told. It is youth speaking; more than that, it is intelligent and observing youth speaking—youth amid hurried times; youth full of hot desire and quick characterization. At times it is too sure; at other times, less certain; but lovable all the way through. It is as if he sat with us before the open fire and told us of his adventures while the reflection of the flames accentuated the emotional lines of his face. Taken all in all, it is a worthwhile book, and Mr. Douglas has synthesized the spirit and viewpoint of the prosecessionist intelligent youth just as convincingly as Professor Avery Craven did for the aged die-hard secessionist in his *Edmund Ruffin*.

It is a pity that some comment must be made of a few faults. Most of the larger errors have been caught by Professor Fletcher M. Green, and he has made admirable explanations in his Notes (pp. 359-82). This is a welcome departure from the earlier books of the sort and reflects great credit on the publishers. Other errors flit through the pages—some of a minor factual nature; others which spring from a youthful lack of objectivity; others, perhaps, due to conversations with men in after years whose opinions were valued. A few examples: The continuing eulogy of Jackson is quite becoming in one who had learned to love the old warrior, but it glosses over many of Jackson's known faults recognized by those who have cared to investigate and who, in spite of the faults, still love the old fighter. Mr. Douglas' comments on Early and Gordon (p. 33) are open to question, depending on which side of the controversial fence one stands. Douglas is a bit free with superlatives—perhaps it is youth speaking; or is it a common fault of biographers who edit their manuscripts in later years? And the reviewer must take exception to the repetition of the Pendleton myth concerning Longstreet's responsibility for the disaster at Gettysburg (p. 248). The Pendleton thesis—long exploded—has no place in a book supposed to have been written immediately after the war, and gives rise to many suspicions as to the validity of the whole work. Nor can we support Douglas' contention (p. 251) that Longstreet was at fault in not supporting Pickett.

Much of his discussion of Jackson is gossip—at least Douglas was not intimate with Jackson until the war was well along (p. 39). Jackson's fast marches are described, but the author omits reference to the large number of stragglers now

known by writers to have dotted the roadsides behind the famous "foot cavalry." As to Jackson's resignation and the Douglas version (p. 26), the *Official Records* (Johnston to Jackson, February 3, 1862, Ser. I, Vol. V, 1059-60) seem to indicate that Johnston and not Colonel A. R. Boteler was responsible for inducing Jackson to withdraw the letter of resignation.

What most students of the period wish to know is what caused Jackson's delay at the battle of Gaines's Mill and, later, at Fair Oaks. Douglas writes hesitatingly on this point (pp. 100-105) and rather indicates that Lee was at fault, but he is not at all convincing.

And so one could write on. But why make pinpricks in a good solid book that is well worth the reading and the owning? It is a good book for those who are not well schooled in the technical language of military operations. It is a splendid deposit of sharp and observing characterization of those who played leading parts in that theater of the war. It is a helpful book for those who wish to enjoy the thrill of war and be spared the hideous detail. Mr. Douglas appraises leadership uncommonly well for one so young—or did he write that part of it in after years? One cannot be sure. He claims justly that the men "were proud of Lee, admired [Joseph E.] Johnston, loved Jackson" (p. 70), which, on mature consideration, is a fine appraisal of what each leader was entitled to expect. And, even if we may disagree about the others, it is possible that Douglas was the nearer right in his vivid and human descriptions of some of the lesser generals and leaders.

It is a good book—well worth having and well worth a rereading, not only for the sheer pleasure of it; but, for each historian and biographer, it should serve as an efficient and continuing Nemesis guarding the morals of Clio.

United States Army

DONALD BRIDGMAN SANGER

"*Old Bald Head*" (General R. S. Ewell): *The Portrait of a Soldier*. By Percy Gatling Hamlin. (Strasburg, Virginia: Shenandoah Publishing House, Inc., 1940. Pp. x, 216. Illustration, bibliography, appendices, maps. \$2.50.)

Perhaps the chief significance of *Old Bald Head* is that for the first time a more or less complete account of Richard Stoddert Ewell's career is presented in a single volume. Rather than a full-length biography, however, it is essentially a Civil War monograph. Eleven pages are sufficient to launch young Ewell on his first army assignment in 1840, and only six pages are devoted to the period between the end of the war and his death in 1872. Nevertheless, there are forty pages which deal with Ewell's activities between 1840 and 1860, based in part on incidental references contained in printed government reports and on material unearthed in the files of the adjutant general.

While there is much of a colorful nature in the book, the going is heavy in

spots, particularly when battle maneuvers are treated without relevant maps and with occasional irrelevant detail. But Mr. Hamlin does bring out clearly the human side of the lisping, profane, high-tempered Ewell, who at first distrusted Stonewall Jackson but learned to worship him; who lost a leg at Groveton in 1862 but returned to the army and commanded the Second Corps at Gettysburg; who married his widowed sweetheart of earlier years during the course of the war; and who was finally captured on the retreat from Richmond and incarcerated in Fort Warren. Unfortunately, the breach between Ewell and Early is passed over with only a casual reference. The gradual exhaustion of southern strength is, however, subtly traced.

Mr. Hamlin feels that Ewell's error at Gettysburg lay not so much in his failure to force Cemetery Hill on the first day, but in his failure that night to shift his corps, or at least Johnson's Division, to the right as Lee suggested. Had the Second Corps been in proper position, "the second day at Gettysburg would probably have decided the battle for the Confederates" (p. 201). As to the firing of Richmond, he confirms the generally accepted view that Ewell, acting under orders to destroy the cotton and tobacco stored there, was not responsible for the general conflagration.

Chief among the sources for *Old Bald Head* are the Ewell papers at the College of William and Mary, the papers of Campbell Brown, staff officer and stepson, a manuscript ("The Ewells of Virginia") by Ewell's stepdaughter, the *Southern Historical Society Papers*, and a wide variety of wartime diaries, journals, and memoirs. Unfortunately, there are few reference footnotes, although the book abounds in long quotations. The illustrations consist of an aerial view of Gettysburg, with the various Confederate positions superimposed, and two maps illustrating the positions of May 5, 1864, and April 6, 1865, respectively. The four appendices, properly incorporated in the text, would strengthen it. A five-page bibliography and an inadequate four-page index round out the volume.

Colgate University

CHARLES R. WILSON

One Hundred Years at V.M.I. Volumes III and IV. By Colonel William Couper. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, Inc., 1940. Pp. ix, 409; ix, 453. Illustrations, bibliography. \$6.00.)

Though the copyright date is given as 1939, these two volumes did not actually appear until midwinter of 1940-1941. In them Colonel Couper completes his account of the first century of the Virginia Military Institute's existence. He follows the scrapbook method of presentation characteristic of the first two volumes, thereby making available quite a mass of fascinating and flavorful original material.

In the second volume, the writer outlined the Confederate period and carried the war history in detail through the New Market campaign. He begins the

third volume with a chapter on Hunter's Raid and the destruction of the Institute by the enemy in May-June, 1864; he tells of the furloughing of the cadets for the summer of 1864 and of the efforts to complete emergency reconstructions in time for the fall opening, of the practical conscription of the corps in the meantime to serve in the trenches before Richmond, of the release of the cadets from Confederate service in December, 1864, and of their going into academic quarters at the Alms House, lent by the city of Richmond. From this temporary campus the cadets answered occasional calls to repel invaders. On the night of April 1, 1865, the cadets marched out on their fourteenth call to active duty, and early the next morning occupied front line trenches opposing Negro troops. Pursuant to orders for the evacuation of Richmond, the corps was remarched that afternoon to the Alms House, and there disbanded to make their way to their several homes as best they might. Most of them reached home, but some attached themselves to other organizations and were killed in last-minute fighting. After the grim toll of war came reorganization and rebuilding. Matthew Fontaine Maury, late commander, C. S. N. (called "Commodore" by courtesy), was appointed professor of physics in 1868. The narrative at this point is interrupted to reproduce in full an address given by the writer in 1932 on Maury and Stonewall Jackson. Next follows a chapter on reconstruction and the death of General Lee, at that time president of the neighboring Washington College; then brief chapters on Lee as the South's hero and the respect which V. M. I. cadets traditionally pay as they pass his tomb, and on the Lee and Jackson portraits presented to the Institute in 1869. Cadet life in the 1870's is described at length. A very long but interesting digression on the historic guns placed on the campus follows. This volume is concluded with Chapter XXXV, "Molly McGuire, Fourteen," a short story written by the late Colonel Frederick Stuart Greene, and reprinted from *Century Magazine* of September, 1917. It was included because it illustrates "some of the traditions connected with the V. M. I. finals."

Volume IV begins with a description of the semicentennial celebration in 1889, followed by an account of life in the 1890's and of the construction in 1892-1897 of the first memorial assembly hall, which was proposed by the Alumni Association in 1866 in honor of Stonewall Jackson. Next, Colonel Couper reprints in full Dr. Hunter McGuire's address at the inauguration of Jackson Memorial Hall on June 23, 1897. This address is particularly valuable because Dr. McGuire was the medical director of the army corps which Jackson commanded. The presentation of twentieth century history is broken by a chapter on the alumni, 1842-1900; it is resumed only to be broken by the addresses of two alumni delivered in 1912 on the occasion of the unveiling of a monument to Jackson. The second of these addresses discusses the character and achievements of the Institute's good genius and tutelary saint to the extent of fifty pages. Next come, as separate chapters, an address by a V. M. I. professor

in 1933 on the characteristics of the graduates, and one by another professor on "Life at V. M. I. during the World War, 1917-1920." Two chapters of narrative serve to conclude the first hundred years; but there follow five chapters on the biography of the superintendents, in quotation of an address on the athletics, and in description of the reservation, the campus architecture, and the museum. Finally, there is quoted an address by the writer (Chapter LIII) on "Fragments of V. M. I. History."

Colonel Couper did not propose to write a simple narrative history, but rather, as he says in his prologue, to "mirror cadet life at V. M. I. and treat of historical events in which the institution and its élèves have had a part . . . as far as practicable" in the words of "those who described what they saw in person." In the execution of his purpose he has presented posterity with a remarkable compendium of historical lore of one of the outstanding schools in America.

Norfolk Navy Yard

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

Virginia, The New Dominion. By Agnes Rothery. Illustrated by E. H. Suydam. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940. Pp. xii, 368. Illustrations. \$5.00.)

This handsome and readable volume is a broad survey of Virginia's geographical divisions, varied peoples, political leaders, diversified economy, historical treasures, and magnificent scenery. Virginians are shown at work and play on mountain, plain, and seashore; at the business of government, farming, and manufacturing. It is correctly recognized that "The New Dominion" is the product of history, tradition, and progress, and that the last has always been strongly influenced by the past as well as by the new forces of the present. One is fascinated by many excellent descriptions of town and country and by succinct and masterly summaries of complicated situations, institutions, human types, and events. But the informed reader is deeply chagrined by numerous errors of fact and interpretation when the author deals with history and government. This is the more to be lamented because such an interesting book is likely to be widely read especially by those who are not prepared to recognize inaccuracies or hasty generalizations.

Miss Rothery has written in a charming manner of the picturesque and of things about which it is pleasant to read. The refreshing chapter on "Old Springs and New Spas" resurcts that glamorous century-long era when members of the upper class "took the waters" during the summer social season at their favorite resort or spring—White, Sweet, Warm, Buffalo, Hot, Wallawhatoola, or one of the many others—according to their choice. She gives an attractive but hardly a representative picture by great emphasis on horse racing, "the art of living," and the idea that "the most attractive thing about Virginia . . . has always been the Virginians." What proportion of the people are included in the statement: "One

commonly addresses a letter to a Virginian—unless he lives in an actual city—with the name of the addressee, the name of his estate and the name of the county"? And what percentage of those so addressed are native Virginians? A more typical picture is given of the sturdy stock of the Valley of Virginia where small farms, neat homes, and prosperity make for a more satisfied and wealthy people as individuals. A deserved tribute is given to the fine work of Archdeacon Frederick W. Neve among the mountain people near Charlottesville, but why is there no discussion of the dozens of other social and religious workers in the Virginia mountains? Senator Byrd is given justifiable praise for his masterly revelation of Federal extravagance in the construction of resettlement projects in these mountains. But the incident would be much more worthy of praise if Miss Rothery had pointed to an educational or social program which the Senator might have devised or supported for the improvement of these mountain folk and the thousands of other marginal peoples in rural Virginia.

In giving the historical setting to show how "The New Dominion" "is so happily evolving from the Old," the author makes frequent errors. The relationship shown between the old planters of eastern Virginia and the present government of the state is at least not convincing because it does not take into consideration the facts of the transition which has taken place. Virginia has never been bounded between the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth parallels. Of course there were children in Virginia before 1619. Williamsburg did not exist in 1629. Liberty Hall (the forerunner of Washington and Lee University) was moved to the vicinity of Lexington, not Lynchburg, in 1780. Claudius Crozet was chairman of the first Board of Visitors, but by no means was he the founder of the Virginia Military Institute. Mencken used the phrase "Sahara of the Bozarts," not "Beaux Arts." And there are more.

In the analysis of government as well as history some amazing statements are given. It is pointed out that "The entrance of the Federal government into the field of social security and health exemplified Virginia's willingness to accept new ventures and to adapt itself to a shift in responsibility." The author does not reveal that both of Virginia's senators and most of her representatives voted against this Federal program, that the government of Virginia was the forty-eighth in the Union to adopt it, and that final action was taken only after public opinion forced the calling of a special and expensive session of the state legislature. Many will differ with the effusive praise given the men who brought Virginia through the depression with a balanced budget, low taxes, and excellent credit. It is not made clear that this was done not entirely by the "common sense" and "moderation" of the state's leaders and their opposition to "the fanaticisms and messianic ideas of crackpots and upstarts." The answer is found in part in large Federal expenditures for relief and the curtailing of funds for education and social services as well as in the desirable pruning of normal expenses. Inconsistency is noted in the strong praise for Virginia's low taxes on

industry and the statement that "In her ability to support education she ranks 35th among the 48 states, but in effort she is 47th." One is surprised too that Mary Johnston is placed above Ellen Glasgow as a historical novelist, but again the author appears to be on unfamiliar ground, for she says that Miss Glasgow's fame rests on her early novels, the only one cited being one of her most immature and that with the wrong date.

One regrets making so many adverse comments about a book which is so excellently written and which has such a wealth of informative and descriptive material on the present Virginia. Certainly Miss Rothery is at her best writing books of description and travel for which she is well known.

In his numerous excellent pencil sketches used to illustrate the book Mr. Suydam has caught much of the charm, diversity, and spirit of "The New Dominion," and the result is one of the most handsome volumes we have seen.

Washington and Lee University

ALLEN W. MOGER

The Vanishing Virginian. By Rebecca Yancey Williams. With an Introduction by Douglas Southall Freeman. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1940. Pp. 277. \$2.50.)

Social history of a consequential sort has often been written primarily for its value as literature, as was more or less the case with Hamlin Garland's studies of the Middle Border. He who would contend that professional historians are too prone to neglect or despise this particular impulse to publication now has at hand a fresh case in point.

To the world of belles-lettres and to the general public which has promptly demanded impressive reprintings of this popular volume, Mrs. Williams' anecdotal portrait of her robust, rollicking father and of the family life which revolved around him is a literary gem to be more than mentioned in the same breath with Clarence Day's *Life with Father*. As such, it is certainly a thoroughly agreeable series of twenty sketches, brimful of good humor and of the explosive expletives, prejudices, whims, and opinions of an irascible but altogether lovable lawyer in whom were combined the discipline of the Virginia Military Institute and the individualism of the University of Virginia. But it is not unfair to judge this unpretentious book by other standards.

This irrepressible and fascinating paterfamilias was Robert Yancey, captain of the post-bellum Home Guard and commonwealth's attorney in Lynchburg during the thirty-five years prior to 1930. But "Captain Bob's" truest historical significance lies in his daughter's revelations of a way of life and a manner of thinking which, no matter how unique the described participants may have been, were quite typical a generation or two ago in the Old Dominion. "Looking back," the reminiscent raconteur reflects, "it seems to me that all of my childhood was entangled with the past." She portrays her father as a product of the Old South,

her tolerant, imperturbable mother as "the mid-Victorian Virginian," and their numerous children as "hard-crusted moderns" who belonged to "the age when Virginia was just beginning to become Americanized." Her mother (author in 1935 of a creditable volume of local history, *Lynchburg and Its Neighbors*) was a devotee of genealogy and usually the object of family scorn on that account, but though "Captain Bob" would admit kinship to William Lowndes Yancey without pride, he was quick to defend the equality of Nancy Langhorne (Lady Astor), daughter of one of his friends, with hereditary English noblemen. The Yancey summers were spent at the family estate, purchased from Thomas Jefferson, in nearby Bedford County; several Negro servants played memorable roles in the family life; "Captain Bob" faced disapprovingly the prohibition and Ku Klux Klan issues; there are hints of a challenging commercial and industrial *nouveau riche* class; and other typical trends, attitudes, and characteristics beyond mention here, and too seldom recorded anywhere, are disclosed. Thus *The Vanishing Virginian* is a document worthy of possible citation for its political, economic, and social import.

What is more, it may be of value to biographers, though it naturally lacks an index and evidences of authentication, for a small host of notable figures are introduced as friends of the family or as traditional characters of the locale. These include, for example, John Hook, the Scottish merchant of Bedford County who was a Loyalist during the Revolution; Patrick Henry, who prosecuted Hook in a *cause célèbre*; John Randolph of Roanoke; Governor Fitzhugh Lee; Lieutenant General Jubal A. Early, the picturesque Civil War defender and later resident of Lynchburg; its senators, John Warwick Daniel and Carter Glass; and various members of the Ambler, Berkeley, Harrison, Minor, and Nelson families.

In brief, this delightful serving of literary and historical dessert has a genuinely Virginian flavor.

Emory University

W. EDWIN HEMPHILL

The South in Progress. By Katharine DuPre Lumpkin. (New York: International Publishers, 1940. Pp. 256. \$2.50.)

This compact and meaty volume deserves a wide reading. The author is a southern woman with an excellent grasp of this region's fundamental problems. She views those problems through progressively oriented lenses, and analyzes them trenchantly. Many of the questions she examines have been examined by others before her, but the reviewer knows of no single work which covers just the ground included in the volume under notice. Basically, this is the story of the South's agriculture, industry, race relations, politics, and social attitudes for the decade of the thirties. Others have subjected one or more of these problems to scrutiny, but no one seems to have tackled them all between the covers of a single book. Dr. Lumpkin manages to be highly informing in every sphere, and within a compass of only 256 pages.

Consider, for example, her study of southern sharecropping and its social consequences. She begins by pointing out something which has not been sufficiently emphasized, namely, that the establishment of this vicious system which has bound so much of the agricultural South to cotton and the "furnishing merchant," and has brought such criticism upon the region, could have been prevented by the victorious North after the Civil War. What was needed was a fair and comprehensive program of government aid in the redistribution of land and the organization of a viable system of credit. As it was, the Federal authorities made no serious effort to achieve this, and the southern landlords devised almost the only system available to a shattered society largely without cash resources, and faced with the problem of digesting millions of ignorant men, women, and children who had just emerged from slavery.

Dr. Lumpkin also addresses herself forthrightly to the problems having to do with labor and industry below the Potomac. She is clearly on the side of labor, just as she is on the side of the sharecropper in his conflicts with the landlord. She gives a cogent account of southern workers' struggles for the right to organize. If she is a bit too oblivious to the problems of the employer who has built up his business on the basis of lower wages than those paid by his northern competitor—partly because the wage scale throughout the entire region has always been lower, and partly because the aforesaid competitor enjoys a freight rate advantage averaging from 35 to 75 per cent—her approach seems predominantly sound.

The author is especially effective in her chapters which describe the impact of the New Deal upon the South. By and large, that impact has been distinctly salutary, of course, although she seems too much inclined, in chronicling the South's indebtedness to the Roosevelt regime, to write every foe of the New Deal down as a sinister tool of the interests. Those who sincerely objected to the methodology of President Roosevelt's Supreme Court enlargement plan, while conceding the court's excessively reactionary attitude, who favored reductions in WPA appropriations, and who attacked Hugo L. Black because he had joined the Klan, get short shrift in these pages. The author also seems oblivious to the machinations of the Communists in various southern labor movements, notably the sharecroppers' union. The Muscovite brethren nearly succeeded in wrecking that union, and hence do not deserve the complete oblivion which has been vouchsafed them here. Similarly, the Workers' Alliance, whose president resigned last June because of the strong Communist influence in the organization, is accorded only the highest praise.

On the whole, however, this is a book of especial value. It is a useful and scholarly compendium of information concerning the South for the decade lately ended, and is written lucidly and forcefully, withal.

Historical News and Notices

The August issue of the *Journal* will carry, as a part of this section, a compilation of "Research Projects in Southern History" in progress. The list is being compiled from questionnaires submitted to members of the Association several weeks ago; if any have not been returned to the *Journal* office, they should be sent in at once if they are to be included in this year's compilation.

PERSONAL

The fifth series of Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History, sponsored by the graduate school and the department of history, Louisiana State University, was delivered March 18-21 by J. Fred Rippy of the University of Chicago. The theme of the series, "The United States and the Republics of South America," provided four specific subjects for the lecturer: "Defining the American System," "Resources and Politics of South America," "Commercial Relations," and "Tierra Dorado." The sixth series, to be delivered a year hence, will be given by Paul H. Buck of Harvard University.

Samuel C. Mitchell will retire at the end of the present year as head of the department of history and political science at the University of Richmond, but will continue as a part-time teacher for the session of 1941-1942. Ralph C. McDanel has been made head of the department, effective in September, 1941.

Lewis E. Atherton, assistant professor of history at the University of Missouri, has been granted a Guggenheim Fellowship for the year 1941-1942 to work on "Early Merchandising in the South." He will also have assistance from the University of Missouri Research Council.

Visiting professors at the University of Missouri summer school will be Carl C. Rister of the University of Oklahoma, E. Wilson Lyon of Colgate University, and Henry Johnson (retired) of Columbia University Teachers College.

W. G. Bean of Washington and Lee University, Frank L. Owsley of Vanderbilt University, and Dan Thomas of Rhode Island State College will offer summer school courses at the University of Alabama.

The following summer session appointments at Duke University have been announced: Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina; Richard H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania; Oswald H. Wedel, University of Arizona;

Dana B. Durand, Harvard University; Paul W. Gates, Cornell University; Mack Swearingen, Womans College of the University of Georgia; J. J. Mathews, University of Mississippi; John K. Bettersworth, Mississippi State College; Charles S. Davis, Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

At the University of North Carolina visiting professors for the summer session will be Oliver P. Chitwood, West Virginia University; Henry T. Shanks, Birmingham-Southern College; Chester McA. Destler, Georgia Teachers College.

Other summer school migrations called to the attention of the *Journal*: Philip Davidson of Agnes Scott College to teach at the University of Texas; Hugh T. Lefler of the University of North Carolina to teach at the University of Pennsylvania; Charles E. Smith of Louisiana State University to teach at Pennsylvania State College; Paul H. Clyde of Duke University to teach at West Virginia University; George E. Mowry of the University of North Carolina to teach at the University of Wisconsin; Charles Timm of the University of Texas to teach at the University of Arkansas; Howard K. Beale of the University of North Carolina to teach at the Johns Hopkins University; Bingham Duncan of Westminster College to teach at the University of Mississippi; Josiah C. Russell of the University of North Carolina to teach at New Mexico State College.

William B. Hatcher, associate professor of history at Louisiana State University, is on leave for the current semester and the 1941 summer session to serve as acting dean of the University's John McNeese Junior College at Lake Charles. He will return to teaching duties at the University in September. In the interim his classes are in charge of Fred C. Cole, editorial associate of the *Journal of Southern History*. S. W. Higginbotham, graduate student at the University, is serving as editorial assistant on the *Journal* staff.

The following activities of members of the guild have been called to the attention of the *Journal*: Henry T. Shanks, professor of history at Birmingham-Southern College, is on leave for the second semester of the current year. He is in Raleigh, engaged in editing the Willie Mangum Papers. John F. Ramsey, assistant professor of European history at the University of Alabama, is on leave for the current semester to pursue research in Washington. His classes are in charge of Bernard Weber of Stanford University. C. Van Woodward, on leave from Scripps College, is working at various southern depositories on a history of the South from the end of Reconstruction to the World War. He will devote the summer to research in Washington.

H. B. Fant, Division of State Department Archives, The National Archives, left his position in March for a year's military service. As captain of infantry his initial assignment was to the Publications Committee, the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia.

The Committee on Southern Grants-in-Aid of the Social Science Research Council has awarded a grant to James L. Glanville of Southern Methodist University to assist in the completion of a study on "Italian Imperialism, 1897-1914."

B. I. Wiley of the University of Mississippi will continue research on "Everyday Life of the Confederate Soldier" in research centers in North Carolina, Virginia, and Washington, D. C., during the summer of 1941.

The following promotions in the historical guild may be noted: Frontis W. Johnston to professor of history at Davidson College; James W. Silver to associate professor of history at the University of Mississippi.

Archibald McLeish of the Library of Congress addressed the March meeting of the Maryland Historical Society.

Robert Paine Pell, president of Converse College from 1902 until his retirement in 1933, died on February 7, 1941, at his winter home in Orlando, Florida. Born in 1860 in North Carolina, where his father was editor of the Raleigh *Sentinel* during the stormy days of Reconstruction, Dr. Pell had lived through and observed at firsthand much of the South's history for the past seventy-five years. Though never a teacher of history nor a writer in this field, he always maintained an avid interest in the subject, particularly as relating to North and South Carolina, and had been a member of the Southern Historical Association for a number of years.

The death of Jesse Thomas Wallace, head of the department of history at Mississippi College since 1907, occurred on April 30, 1940. Professor Wallace was born on a farm near Coila, Carroll County, Mississippi, September 18, 1872. He received his elementary schooling and what now corresponds to high school education in the common schools of Carroll County. He attended Lexington Normal School at Lexington, Mississippi, from which he received the B. S. degree, the course of study in this institution approximating courses offered in junior colleges. Subsequently he attended the University of Mississippi, from which he received the B. A. and M. A. degrees, the latter in chemistry. Later he completed an M. A. course in history at the University of Chicago and in 1928 received the doctor's degree in history at Columbia University.

Beginning at the age of eighteen years, Professor Wallace taught in the schools of Carroll and Holmes counties. After graduating from the Lexington Normal College he taught successively at Louisville, Braxton, Brooksville, Centreville, and Tupelo, and, in 1907, began a thirty-three year period of service at Mississippi College. He was the author of *A History of the Negroes of Mississippi from 1865 to 1890* (1927), *The Development of Roads in Mississippi*, and various syllabi used in state teachers' institutes and normals. Wherever he

taught he ranked as a capable executive, a strict disciplinarian, and an instructor of unusual ability. From his early youth he was active in religious work, serving as Sunday School teacher and superintendent, as deacon, and as lecturer on various religious subjects.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The past few years have witnessed the origin of new state historical societies in the South, the revival of old ones, and the inauguration of historical periodicals. In January, 1939, appeared the first issue of the *Journal of Mississippi History*, published by the Mississippi Historical Society. In October of the same year the first number of *West Virginia History* came from the press, sponsored by the State Department of Archives and History. The *Alabama Historical Quarterly*, published by the State Department of Archives and History, was revived in the spring of 1940, after lying dormant for a decade.

The latest historical activity emanates from Arkansas. On February 22 a group of about a hundred assembled at Little Rock, organized the Arkansas Historical Association, and provided for the publication of a quarterly journal. The following officers of the Association were elected: president, John H. Reynolds, president of Hendrix College; vice-presidents, Dallas T. Herndon of the Arkansas History Commission, Thomas S. Staples of Hendrix College, J. S. Utley of Little Rock, and Mrs. J. F. Weinmann of Little Rock; secretary-treasurer, Fred H. Harrington of the University of Arkansas. David Y. Thomas, professor emeritus of history at the University of Arkansas, will edit the Association's journal, assisted by an editorial board consisting of D. D. McBrien of Arkansas State Teachers College, Granville Davis of Little Rock Junior College, Richard E. Yates of Hendrix College, and Clara B. Eno of Van Buren. There is a director of the Association from each congressional district. The Association will have as its purposes the publication of a quarterly magazine, the collection and preservation of historical material, and the stimulation of interest in the past.

The Pontotoc County Historical Society was organized at Ada, Oklahoma, on March 7. G. M. Harrell of East Central State College was elected president and Mrs. E. O. Wheat secretary. Several members of the Oklahoma Historical Society, including the Secretary, attended the organization meeting. The new Society decided to co-operate with the Ada Public Library in building up a collection of manuscripts and historical works dealing with the history of Pontotoc County.

At a meeting of the Oklahoma Education Association on February 7 the history section was revived and the following officers were chosen: president, T. H. Ballenger, Northeastern State College; vice-president, James D. Morrison, Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College; secretary, James W. Moffitt, Oklahoma Historical Society.

The Oklahoma Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has

placed its state library in the library of the Oklahoma Historical Society. It is preparing to set up a completely furnished colonial period room in the museum of the State Historical Society.

The Florida Historical Society assembled in Miami March 26-28 for its thirty-ninth annual meeting. The three-day program included a discussion of "Ceremonial Practices of the Modern Seminoles," by Robert F. Greenlee; "Old Fort Lauderdale," by Mrs. Frank Stranahan; "Famous Floridians on United States Stamps," by Irvin F. Duddleson; "Tequesta, a Miami of the Sixteenth Century," by Robert E. McNicoll; "History of Palm Beach County," by James M. Owens, Jr.; "History of Plant Introductions in Southern Florida," by David Fairchild; "Frederick Delius, Composer," by Gerard Tetley; "History of the Koreshan Unity," by A. H. Andrews; "Spanish Land Grants in Florida," by Louise B. Hill; "An Early Settler," by Wirth M. Munroe; and "Old Coconut Grove," by John C. Gifford. The presidential address was delivered by C. H. Curry. "Comments on Exhibits of Floridiana" were made by Mrs. James M. Carson. An interesting feature of the meeting was a colored moving picture, with sound track, of "Middle America," lent by the Middle American Research Institute of Tulane University. The picture was introduced by Maurice Ries.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The Emory Alumnus (Vol. XVII, No. 1, January, 1941) contains a brief article on the "Confederate Collection" of the late Keith M. Read, by Richard B. Harwell. This collection of approximately a thousand imprints, assembled in the Emory University Library, includes many items unavailable elsewhere, according to Mr. Harwell. Among these are Oscar A. Cantrell, *Sketches of the First Regiment Ga. Vols.* (Atlanta, 1864); William H. Peck, *The Conspirators of New Orleans* (Greenville, Ga., 1863); *The Angel Daughter* (Atlanta, 1863); *Letter of W. C. Smedes in Vindication of the Southern Confederacy* (Jackson, Miss., 1861); *Overthrow of the Ballot! a Complete History of the Election in the State of Kentucky, August 3d, 1863* (n. p., 1863 [?]); Kittrell J. Warren, *Ups and Downs of Wife Hunting* (Augusta, 1861); Thomas Rambaut, *The Child's Primer* (Atlanta, 1863); M. P. Caldwell and W. W. Everett, *The Student's Arithmetic* (Atlanta, 1863). The collection embraces 149 official publications of the Confederate government, 146 official state publications, 375 miscellaneous unofficial publications, 172 pieces of sheet music, 11 maps printed as separates, 99 broadsides, and 99 magazines and newspapers (titles).

The Story of Rosalie, Natchez, Mississippi (The Author, Jackson, Miss., pp. 50, illustrations), by Pearl Vivian Guyton, is a chronicle of the shrine of the Mississippi Society, Daughters of the American Revolution. Miss Guyton reviews the history of the southern mansion from its erection in the 1820's to the present time, emphasizing the architectural design, the furnishings, the dispen-

sing of southern hospitality, and the personality of the owners. The booklet is handsomely illustrated with front and rear views of Rosalie, interior views of parlors and kitchen, and floor plans.

Festoons of Fancy, Consisting of Compositions Amatory, Sentimental, and Humorous, in Verse and Prose, by William Littell, Esq. (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Publications Committee, Margaret Vorhies Haggin Trust, 1940, pp. xv, 115, \$5.00), embraces *Kentucky Reprints, No. 1*. The author of this piece of satire, first printed at Louisville in 1814, migrated to Kentucky in 1801. In compiling the state's laws, 1792-1809, and in preparing other legal works, Littell made a decided contribution to legal scholarship. But in perusing the handiwork of Kentucky legislators, "he found much grist for his keen wit" and "was the first to record the humors of a frontier state." In *Festoons of Fancy* "he discusses, in many instances in dialogue, the Kentucky Insurance Company, the State Bank, the Song of Triumph, the Ohio Canal, Divorce, the Petition of Gregory Woodcock and many other subjects pertinent to Kentucky history" (p. xi). The book "is now being reprinted because it has definite and lasting historical and literary value, not only to Kentuckians, but to all students of the frontier. This book is the beginning of humorous and satirical writing on the American frontier, and it has not been improved upon to any revolutionary degree" (pp. xiii-xiv). Professor Thomas D. Clark contributes an appropriate introduction which describes the Kentucky background of Littell's work, and evaluates his legal and literary writings. The work is attractively printed by the Princeton University Press; a facsimile of the first edition's title page provides contemporary atmosphere.

The Story of Soil Conservation in the South Carolina Piedmont 1800-1860 (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, *Miscellaneous Publication No. 407*, November, 1940, pp. 35, illustrations, 10¢), by Arthur R. Hall of the Soil Conservation Service, presents "an analytical account of some of . . . [the] early attempts to conserve the soil in a region where cotton was the staple crop and water erosion the principal form of soil exhaustion" (p. 2). The bulletin discusses the agricultural reform movement in the ante-bellum period, grassland and forest revegetation as a means of conserving the soil, maintenance of soil fertility through diversification, plowing and hillside ditching as erosion-control practices, and economic barriers to agricultural reform.

The German-Swiss in Franklin County, Tennessee (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture, June, 1940, pp. 113, illustrations), by Walter M. Kollmorgen of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, is "A Study of the Significance of Cultural Considerations in Farming Enterprises." With historical approach and analytical method, the author presents a wide range of data to prove that the German-Swiss in a cultural island "have shown themselves to be constructive farmers"; that "they have realized more adequately than

the control groups the potentialities of the soil in a self-sustaining as well as in a commercial type of farming"; that they "have demonstrated that a highly diversified form of agriculture is possible and relatively profitable on the red limestone soils of the near-South"; that their "diversified farming program . . . could well be extended southward on comparable soils, but that cotton growing could not be extended much farther northward"; and "that the farms in the control groups are not operated as efficiently as they might be and that the point of diminishing returns has not been reached in their operation" (pp. 106-107).

Men-Land-Phosphate (Auburn, Ala.: Alabama Polytechnic Institute Extension Service, *Circular 220*, January, 1941, pp. 37), by Charles S. Davis, records the history of a "cooperative agricultural research and demonstration work" program sponsored by the Alabama Polytechnic Institute and the TVA. The Muscle Shoals Nitrate Plant manufactures three types of phosphate fertilizer and a by-product, calcium-silicate slag—all valuable for maintaining soil fertility. Several land-grant colleges, including Auburn, have been selected to test these fertilizers on different soil types and plants. Test demonstrations are being conducted in two divisions of Alabama—in the watershed counties of the Tennessee Valley and in the central and southern portions of the state. The pamphlet shows how the program helps to conserve soil and how it helps farmers to make readjustments.

The University Greys: Company A, Eleventh Mississippi Regiment, Army of Northern Virginia, 1861-1865 (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, Inc., 1940, pp. xii, 80, frontispiece, \$2.00), by Maud Morrow Brown, were recruited in part from students at the University of Mississippi. An initial chapter views the University scene in the closing years of the ante-bellum period and discusses the organization of the company on the University campus. The volume is composed mainly of letters from members of the company, supplemented by correspondence of other soldiers in the regiment which throw light on the activities of the company. Personal accounts are occasionally checked with the *Official Records*. The letters contain pertinent information on camp life and army routine, military engagements, and the like. A section of statistical data reprints from the *Weekly Clarion*, September 27, 1866, a compilation of killed, wounded, professional distribution, etc., prepared by a captain of the company, John V. Moore, and reproduces a record of individual participation, compiled by Dunbar Rowland from materials in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History and the War Department.

Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society, Volume I, 1940-41 (Charlottesville, Va.: The Society, March, 1941, pp. 51), edited by Lester J. Cappon, illustrates the constructive work that can be accomplished by a vigorous local historical society. The present volume contains two meritorious articles: "Thomas

Walker of Albemarle," by Natalie J. Disbrow; and "Echoes of the Moon Ghost," by Frances M. Butts. The "Notes and Documents" section includes "A Postscript from Monticello, July 4, 1826," edited by Lester J. Cappon; "Reorganization of the Monticello Guard after the Civil War"; "Newspapers of Albemarle County, Virginia," compiled by Glen C. Smith; and "A Plan of 1861 to Preserve Civil War Materials," reprinted from the *Southern Historical Society Papers*, XVI. There is also a "Historical News" section; a "Report of the Archivist," by Francis L. Berkeley, Jr.; the constitution and by-laws of the Society; and a list of members, numbering 226 in January.

Tenth Annual Report of the Archivist, University of Virginia Library, for the Year 1939-40 (Charlottesville, Va.: University of Virginia, 1940, pp. 27), by Lester J. Cappon, makes two significant contributions. In the first place, it shows what Virginia institutions of learning accomplished during the decade of the 1930's "in the field of manuscripts and related historical materials," and links activities in the state "to the progress of this movement in the South and the nation at large" (p. 1). In the second place, it surveys the manuscript holdings of the University of Virginia, with emphasis on recent acquisitions. The Report is supplemented by a *General Index to First Ten Annual Reports of the Archivist, University of Virginia Library, 1930-31 to 1939-40*.

Guide to Manuscript Collections in the Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, Volume I, second edition (University, La.: Department of Archives, December, 1940, pp. vi, 108), compiled by the Louisiana Historical Records Survey Project and edited by William Ransom Hogan, describes 86 of 604 groups of business and personal papers acquired by the department, 1936-1940. Most of these collections pertain to the lower Mississippi Valley region in the period after 1800. "An examination of this volume," the editor says, "will reveal considerable success in acquiring historical materials in certain fields: papers from the northeastern Louisiana-Natchez area, War for Southern Independence manuscripts, and plantation diaries and account books" (p. i). The "concise analytical summaries" do more than describe the content of the collections; they provide biographical notes on the personalities that figure in the papers as well as citations to printed materials that have utilized the collections. An introduction gives a brief history of the department of archives; the method of titling is explained in a section devoted to "Department of Archives Manuscript Catalog and Filing System." The volume is adequately indexed.

Guide to Depositories of Manuscript Collections in North Carolina (Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1940, pp. 18), was prepared by the North Carolina Historical Records Survey Project. It lists the manuscript holdings of such academic institutions as Duke University, the University of North Carolina, Guilford, Wake Forest, and other colleges; the Historical Foundation of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches at Montreat, and the Archives of

the Moravian Church in America, Southern Province, at Winston-Salem; the North Carolina Historical Commission; and of certain other depositories in North Carolina. It is anticipated that such a *Guide* will be published for each state and for the District of Columbia.

In the last six months the Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, has added 34 accessions to its holdings. Among these are the Marston (Henry, and Family) Papers, 1818-1939, 1,835 items, 47 manuscript volumes, and 12 printed volumes. Included in the personal and business records of Henry Marston and family of Clinton, Louisiana, is material concerning some of the various positions held by Henry Marston—cashier of the Union Bank [of New Orleans] at Clinton, trustee of the Silliman Female Collegiate Institute, and treasurer of the Clinton and Port Hudson Railroad. The plantation diary, 3 volumes, 1822-1832, and the personal diary, 22 volumes, 1855-1884, of Henry Marston, and the war letters of his sons are other important portions of the collection. The Dalrymple (W. H.) Papers, 17 items, 1904, are the lecture notes of the late Professor Dalrymple, founder of the veterinary science department at Louisiana State University. The Weeks (David, and Family) Papers (B), 8 items (typed copies), 1817-1938, including wills of members of the Weeks and Moore families and other documents, are a valuable supplement to the main group of Weeks Papers. The Roy (John) Diary, 1 volume (typed copy), 1860-1862, contains descriptions of the construction of the New Orleans customhouse, where Roy was employed as assistant superintendent of construction; the battle between the Confederate and Federal forces at Forts Jackson and St. Philip; and the evacuation of New Orleans. The Dugas (H. and Felix)—LeBlanc (Joseph E.) Papers, 1866-1933, 143 volumes, are the records of a store at Paincourtville, Louisiana. The Monette (James) Papers (B), contain four letters, 1850-1852, of the Monette family of Morehouse Parish. The Louisiana State University Collection (B), 1899-1916, comprises 379 volumes of theses submitted for the bachelor of arts and the bachelor of science degrees. The Nicholls (Thomas C.) Reminiscences, 1840, 1 item (typed copy), include Judge Nicholls' sketches of the life of his father, Edward Church Nicholls; early life and education in Maryland; a journey from Baltimore to New Orleans, 1805; the city of New Orleans, 1805; a trip to New Iberia; and family life in the Attakapas region of Louisiana. Letters to Samuel J. Lance and family of Buncombe County, North Carolina, including those of John B. and William Bertain Lance while serving in the Confederate army, are the major portion of the Lance (Samuel J.) Papers, 9 items, 1861-1864. The Taylor (Sereno and Mary) Papers, 1853-1869, 11 items and 12 volumes, are a valuable supplement to the Taylor (Calvin, and Family) Papers. Sereno, brother of Calvin Taylor, was a leading educator in the ante-bellum South, and educational material is a feature of the group which contains his personal diary, 12 volumes, 1849-1869. The Burke (E. A.) Papers (B), 1881-1927, supplement previous material on this colorful Recon-

struction and New South personality. The West Indies Manuscript Collection, 1790-1883, 14 items, of documents pertaining to plantation life in the West Indies includes a bill of sale for a plantation with a detailed inventory of property and slaves attached. The English Manuscript Collection consists of 171 items dealing with land tenure in England from the seventeenth century to the present time. The letter book, 1864-1874, of Thomas D. Miller, cotton agent and agent for the Quartermaster's Department, Confederate States Army, Alexandria, Louisiana, is concerned with official matters incurred while attempting to buy or impress cotton in northern Louisiana.

Among recent additions to the manuscript collections of the Maryland Historical Society are the Kent County Marriage Records; the Tolley Family Bible Records; papers of the Smith Family of Charles County; the William Skirven Family Records; papers of the Buchanan and allied families; genealogy and history of the Jerome Family.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"The Life of Richard Malcolm Johnston in Maryland, 1867-1898," concluded, by Francis T. Long, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).

"The Susquehannock Fort on Piscataway Creek," by Alice L. L. Ferguson, *ibid.*

"The Literary Fund of Virginia: Its Relation to Sectionalism in Education," by Ralph V. Merry and Frieda K. Merry, in *West Virginia History* (April).

"The Formation of West Virginia—Debates and Proceedings," by Charles H. Ambler, *ibid.*

"Southern Expectation of British Intervention in the Civil War," continued, by Schuyler D. Hoslett, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (January).

"Virginia's Colonial Arsenal—The Old 'Powder Horn': The Restored Public Magazine at Williamsburg," by J. Luther Kibler, *ibid.*

"Philip Fithian in Virginia," by Mabel Davidson, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (January).

"Education and the Classics in the Life of Colonial Virginia," by Mrs. P. W. Hiden, *ibid.*

"Some Jacobean Links between America and the Orient," concluded, by Boies Penrose, *ibid.*

"The Colonial Churches of Nansemond County, Virginia," by George C. Mason, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (January).

"Richard Lee II, Elizabethan Humanist or Middle-Class Planter?" by Milton Ellis, *ibid.*

"Willie Jones of Halifax," by Blackwell P. Robinson, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).

"Travelers' Accounts as a Source of Kentucky History," by Thomas D. Clark, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (October).

"Danville Was the First Post Office Established in Kentucky and in the Territory beyond the Alleghenies," by William J. Price, *ibid.*

"Cumberland Gap, Gateway of Empire," by Robert L. Kincaid, *ibid.* (January).

"Colonel John Floyd, Kentucky Pioneer," by Hambleton Tapp, *ibid.*

"The Kentucky Colonization Society," by Winston Coleman, Jr., in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (January).

"The Blair Family in the Civil War," continued, by Grace N. Taylor, *ibid.*

"Attorney General Herbert S. Hadley Versus the Standard Oil Trust," by Hazel T. Long, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (January).

"Missouri Railroads during the Civil War and Reconstruction," by Margaret L. Fitzsimmons, *ibid.*

"Early Ste. Genevieve and Its Architecture," by Charles E. Peterson, *ibid.*

"Colonel William Whistler," by Carolyn T. Foreman, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (December).

"The Missionary Work of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, in Oklahoma," II, by Richard H. Harper, *ibid.*

"Governor Daugherty (Winchester) Colbert," by John B. Meserve, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister," continued, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).

"A Wedding of 1841," contributed by Mrs. Robert R. Henderson, *ibid.*

"The Narrative of Colonel James Rigbie," edited by Henry C. Forman, *ibid.*

"The Confederate Raid on Cumberland in 1865," by Basil William Spalding, *ibid.*

"A Baltimore Volunteer of 1864," by William H. James, *ibid.*

"Eliza Godefroy: Destiny's Football," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*

"West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, assembled and edited by Ross B. Johnston, in *West Virginia History* (April).

"Excerpts from Swann's 'Prison Life at Fort Delaware,'" continued, edited by Elizabeth Cometti, *ibid.*

"Amelia County Records: Order Book, 1735-1740," contributed by W. S. Martin, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (January).

"Copies of Extant Wills from Counties Whose Records Have Been Destroyed," edited by George H. S. King, *ibid.*

"A Virginian Pre-Nuptial Agreement of 1678," edited by William M. Sweeny, *ibid.*

"A Crisis in Education, 1834 (Washington College)," concluded, contributed by William D. Hoyt, Jr., in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (January).

"William Byrd Title Book," continued, edited and annotated by Mrs. Rebecca Johnston, *ibid.*

"The Story-Marshall Correspondence (1819-1831)," edited by Charles Warren, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (January).

"Two Unpublished Henry Letters," edited by Hugh B. Johnston, *ibid.*

"Hermon Husband's Continuation of the Impartial Relation," edited by Archibald Henderson, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).

"A Southern Advocate of Methodist Unification in 1865," edited by Nora C. Chaffin, *ibid.*

"Joseph R. Underwood's Fragmentary Journal: Closing Entries Giving His Views on Political Campaigns and President Jackson in Kentucky in 1832," edited by Arndt M. Stickles, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (January).

"The Letters of Colonel Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky," continued, edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (January).

"Early Marriage Records of Madison County, Ky.," continued, compiled by W. Rodes Shackelford, *ibid.*

"Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," II, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*

"Pioneer Recollections," edited by Grant Foreman, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (December).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"The French Theatre in Charleston in the Eighteenth Century," by Edward D. Seeber, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (January).

"William Henry Timrod, the Charleston Volunteers, and the Defense of St. Augustine," by Guy A. Cardwell, Jr., in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).

"Professor Richard Malcolm Johnston," by Edd W. Parks, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).

"College Libraries in Georgia," by Virginia Satterfield, *ibid.*

"Colerain Plantation," II, by Savannah Unit, Georgia Writers' Project, WPA, *ibid.*

"The Yellow Fever Epidemic of 1888 in Jacksonville," by Margaret C. Fairlie, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).

"The Florida Militia and the Affair at Withlacoochee," by Samuel E. Cobb, *ibid.*

"Hiram F. Hammon, Pioneer Homesteader of Palm Beach," by Marian R. Trumbull, *ibid.*

"The Departure of the Spaniards and Other Groups from East Florida, 1763-1764," by Wilbur H. Siebert, *ibid.*

"Colonial Pensacola: The British Period," I, II, by Clinton N. Howard, *ibid.* (October, January).

"Florida, Promoter of Cuban Liberty," by Ruby L. Carson, *ibid.* (January).
"Spanish Contributions in Florida to American Culture," by Verne E. Chatelain, *ibid.*
"The Theater in the Old Southwest: The First Decade at Natchez," by William B. Hamilton, in *American Literature* (January).
"Pierre Clement de Laussat: An Intimate Portrait," by André Lafargue, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (January).
"The Huntsmen of Black Ivory," by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*
"The Life of Richard Taylor," by Jackson B. Davis, *ibid.*
"The Diminishing Influences of German Culture in New Orleans Life since 1865," by William R. Konrad, *ibid.*
"New Orleans Lynchings of 1891 and the American Press," by J. Alexander Karlin, *ibid.*
"George Washington Cable's Literary Apprenticeship," by Arlin Turner, *ibid.*
"Hennepin's *Description of Louisiana*," I, by Jean Delanglez, in *Mid-America* (January).
"The Van Dorn Trails," by J. W. Williams, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).
"Oil, the Courts, and the Railroad Commission," by James P. Hart, *ibid.*
"The Contributions of the Grangers to Education in Texas," by Ralph Smith, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (March).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Marriage and Death Notices from the Edgefield Hive, Jan.-Dec. 1830, vol. 1," copied and contributed by Elizabeth D. English, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (January).
"Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jersey, *ibid.*
"The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jersey, *ibid.*
"Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*
"Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," XIII, by Julia E. Harn, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).
"Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," XVIII, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, *ibid.*
"Florida Historical Material in Niles' Register," selected and annotated by T. Frederick Davis, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).
"From a Remote Frontier: Letters and Documents Pertaining to San Marcos de Apalache, 1763-1769, During the British Occupation of Florida," I, edited by Mark F. Boyd, *ibid.* (January).
"Some Interesting Glimpses of Louisiana a Century Ago (From the old files of the 'Picayune')," edited by Walter Prichard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (January).

"Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, July-September, 1762," LXXXVI, edited by G. Lugano, revised by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, June, 1784," LXVIII, by Laura L. Porteous, with marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Proposals for a French Company for Spanish Louisiana, 1763-1764," edited by Allan Christelow, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (March).

"Christmas and New Year in Texas," edited by Walter P. Webb, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).

"Some Letters of the Texas Revolution," edited by Richard R. Stenberg, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (March).

"Population of the El Paso District in 1692," translated by J. Manuel Espinosa, in *Mid-America* (January).

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

"A Confederate Prisoner at Rock Island: The Diary of Lafayette Rogan," edited by John H. Hauberg, in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (March).

"Dred Scott Eulogized by James Milton Turner: A Historical Observance of the Turner Centenary: 1840-1940," by Irving Dilliard, in the *Journal of Negro History* (January).

"George Frederick Holmes and the Genesis of American Sociology," by Harvey Wish, in the *American Journal of Sociology* (March).

"The John Brown Legend in Pictures: Kissing the Negro Baby," by James C. Malin, in the *Kansas Historical Quarterly* (November).

"The Knights of the Golden Circle: A Filibustering Fantasy," by C. A. Bridges, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).

"Mark Twain and the 'Campaign That Failed,'" by Fred W. Lorch, in *American Literature* (January).

"Printing in the Southwest," by Haniel Long, in the *Southwest Review* (Autumn).

"The Revival of the African Slave Trade in the United States, 1856-1860," by Harvey Wish, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (March).

CONTRIBUTORS

DAVID M. POTTER is instructor in history at Rice Institute.

J. H. EASTERBY is professor of history and director of the library at the College of Charleston.

THOMAS P. MARTIN is assistant chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress.

GORDON WRIGHT is assistant professor of history at the University of Oregon.

ROBERT W. BARNWELL, JR. is a graduate student at Duke University.

GASTON LITTON is assistant archivist in the Division of Interior Department Archives, The National Archives.

The Pacific Historical Review

*Issued by the
Pacific Coast Branch
of the
American Historical Association*

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Associate Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

HAROLD W. BRADLEY

CHARLES B. FAHS

DAN E. CLARK

GEORGE P. HAMMOND

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

WALTER N. SAGE

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;
Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

A sample copy will be sent on request

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

Published in honor of the late Professor William Kenneth Boyd, collector of the Southern Americana that forms the George Washington Flowers Collection at Duke University; historian and promoter of historical studies.

**Laws and Joint Resolutions of the Last Session of the
Confederate Congress (November 7, 1864-March 18,
1865) Together With the Secret Acts of
Previous Congresses**

Edited by Charles W. Ramsdell

A nearly complete set of the *hitherto unpublished* laws of the Confederacy, as compiled from the large group of original unpublished Confederate laws in the George Washington Flowers Collection at Duke University, together with a reconstruction of most of the missing laws from original bills and amendments.

About 200 pp. \$2.50 Ready early in March

American Studies in Honor of William Kenneth Boyd

Edited by David K. Jackson

Eight studies in American, and especially Southern civilization, by the following members of The Americana Club of Duke University: Charles Roberts Anderson, Clarence Gohdes, Jay B. Hubbell, David K. Jackson, William Alexander Mabry, Joseph J. Spengler, Charles S. Sydnor, Edgar T. Thompson.

ix, 377 pp. frontispiece \$4.00

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS • DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

SOUTHERN BIOGRAPHY SERIES

Edward Livingston

Jeffersonian Republican and Jacksonian Democrat

by William B. Hatcher

"Edward Livingston was District Attorney in New York, Congressman, aide-de-camp to Jackson, author of the penal code of Louisiana, Senator, Secretary of State, Minister to France. He had an attractive personality, striking talents, and a fascinating career. Yet how many Americans now know of him? William B. Hatcher has filled in this gap with a scholarly, clear, and well documented study of . . . interest to those curious about American history a century ago . . ."—*Book-of-the-Month-Club News*.

Cloth. \$3.50

Felix Grundy—*Champion of Democracy*

by Joseph Howard Parks

" . . . a lively but authoritative volume on this enigmatic character—a real contribution to the little-known forces at work during the shaping of what we are pleased to call the Jacksonian Era."—*The Atlanta Constitution*.

Cloth. \$3.00

Thomas Spalding of Sapelo

by E. Merton Coulter

"No book of Georgia history or biography in recent years has been more timely or more capably written than the story of this lord of the Golden Isles."—*The Macon Telegraph and News*.

Cloth. \$3.00

"Fightin' Joe" Wheeler

by J. P. Dyer

A biography of the fighting Confederate cavalry chief who was an active participant in almost all the major phases of America's development from Lincoln to the first Roosevelt. This intensely dramatic book will probably be one of the best military biographies of the year.

Ready July 15

Cloth. \$3.00

Louisiana State University Press

University, Louisiana

NEW BOOKS FOR HISTORIANS

THREE VIRGINIA FRONTIERS

by Thomas P. Abernethy

This significant study reveals the manner in which the democratizing influence of the frontier was largely offset by such countervailing factors as European customs and traditions, British legal systems and the methods by which public lands were disposed of.

xiii, 96 pp.

Cloth

\$1.50

FRANCO-AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS, 1816-1836

by Richard Aubrey McLemore

The growth of a vigorous American nationalism during the twenty-one year period following the War of 1812 was coupled with the development of an increasingly aggressive foreign policy. The book traces the resurgence of nationalistic sentiment as it affected the settlement of the French spoliation claims with which American diplomacy was chiefly occupied from 1816 to 1836.

x, 220 pp.

Cloth

\$2.75

EMPIRE OR INDEPENDENCE

by Weldon A. Brown

Mr. Brown's study of the efforts toward reconciliation before and during the American Revolution not only reveals the influence of these attempts on the Revolution itself, but their significant role in altering British colonial policy. His analysis provides a timely study of the manner in which the failure of a few statesmen to grasp basic issues changed the course of history.

x, 338 pp.

Cloth

\$3.75

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University, Louisiana

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

•

PRESIDENT

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of the University of
North Carolina

VICE-PRESIDENT

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, Converse College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives (1941)

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University (1942)

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University (1943)

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

KATHRYN T. ABBEY, Florida State College for Women (1941)

AVERY O. CRAVEN, University of Chicago (1941)

MINNIE CLARE BOYD, Mississippi State College for Women (1942)

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina (1942)

OTIS C. SKIPPER, The Citadel (1943)

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR., Norfolk Navy Yard (1943)